DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 761 CE 027 017

AUTHOR Charters, Alexander N., Comp.
TITLE Historical Perspectives of CSLEA. Volume 3. Notes and Essays: 1965-1967.
INSTITUTION Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Brookline, Mass.: Syracuse Univ., N.Y. Publications Program in Continuing Education.
PUB DATE May 80
NOTE 312p.: For related documents see CE 027 015-020 and CE 027 264-265.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education: Adult Learning: Adult Programs: Cognitive Processes: Colleges: Community: *Continuing Education: Educational Television: *Extension Education: Films: *General Education: *Higher Education: Humanistic Education: Needs Assessment: Noncredit Courses: *Program Development: School Role: Sociocultural Patterns: Universities: Urban Areas: Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS Center for the Study of Liberal Educ for Adults MA

ABSTRACT

This is the third of eight volumes consisting of series of publications of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults (CSLEA), such as Notes and Essays, Research Reports, Occasional Papers, and Conference Reports. These materials provide both theory and practice in the area of non-credit adult liberal education offered by colleges and universities. This volume contains numbers 49, 52, 53, and 54 in the series, Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, 1965-67. Titles include (1) Toward a Homeodynamic Society, (2) Speaking for Myself: A Humanist Approach to Adult Education for a Technical Age (11 essays), (3) Political Backgrounds of Adult Education (6 conference papers), and (4) The Continuing Task: Reflections on Purpose in Higher Continuing Education (4 papers). (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194761

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES OF CSLEA

Volume 3

Notes & Essays: 1965-1967

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alexander N. Charters

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Compiled by

Alexander N. Charters

Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education
220 Huntington Hall
Syracuse, N. Y. 13210 U.S.A.
(315) 423-3421

CE027017

Preface

In the two decades following World War II there was a surge of movement in the field of adult education. Among the exciting developments was the interest in liberal adult education which was encouraged and substantially supported by the Fund for Adult Education. The F.A.E. in return provided leadership and financial support to the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. The primary concern of CSLEA was to provide leadership and specific assistance by resources to colleges and universities to assist them in developing non credit programs in the area of liberal education for adults. During the period the staff initiated and often conducted many seminars and workshops. They also provided consultative services to colleges and universities as they developed programs in liberal education for adults.

Another contribution was the publication of series such as Notes & Essays, Reports, and Occasional Papers. The publications are generally accepted by educators of adults -- nationally and internationally -- as being some of the finest in terms of both theory and practice.

Many publications are now out-of-print and indeed in some cases even our copy is difficult to locate. The requests for copies of CSLEA and other statements are frequently received. Accordingly copies of these documents have been collected and compiled into several volumes. A copy of each volume is being sent to ERIC for their distribution. In this way these valuable publications may be made available to practitioners as well as researchers in adult and continuing education.

Mr. Ralph Brockett and Mrs. B. J. Vaughn have been particularly helpful and diligent in preparing these volumes.

Alexander N. Charters

May, 1980

CONTENTS

TOWARD A HOMEODYNAMIC SOCIETY . . . . R. J. Blakely

SPEAKING FOR MYSELF
A Humanist Approach To Adult Education
For A Technical Age . . . . Andries Deinum

POLITICAL BACKGROUNDS OF ADULT EDUCATION . . . . . . Thomas Cummings, Jr.

THE CONTINUING TASK
Reflections on Purpose In Higher
Continuing Education . . . . Cyril O. Houle
Gordon W. Blackwell
Horace M. Kallen
James B. Whipple

RESOURCES FOR EDUCATORS OF ADULTS D29.49
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

NOTES AND ESSAYS ON EDUCATION FOR ADULTS **49**

TOWARD A HOMEODYNAMIC

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

PUBLICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ROBERT F. CAMPBELL, *Clark University*

JAMES T. CAREY, *University of California*

JOHN P. DYER, *Tulane University*

CYRIL O. HOULE, *University of Chicago*

H. LICHTENSTEIN, *Hofstra College*

JACK LONDON, *University of California*

ERNEST E. MCMAHON, *Rutgers University*

RUSSELL F. W. SMITH, *New York University*

ALAN M. THOMAS, *Canadian Association for Adult Education*

CLIFFORD L. WINTERS, *Syracuse University*

CENTER PUBLICATIONS

Center publications on education of adults include the *Notes and Essays* series examining purposes and philosophy, *Reports* on methods and practices in the field, *Research Reports,* and *Occasional Papers.*

For a complete list and prices write:

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS *AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY*
138 Mountfort St.
Brookline, Mass. 02146

$1.50

6

TOWARD A HOMEODYNAMIC SOCIETY

R. J. Blakely
Editorial Writer
The Chicago Daily News

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**
at Boston University

7

THE CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS was established in 1951 by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with universities seeking to initiate or improve programs of liberal education for adults. In 1964 CSLEA affiliated with Boston University. The purpose of the Center is to help American higher education institutions develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults.

Copyright 1965 by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

PREFACE

This essay is an attempt to answer two big questions: "What are the important social trends? What are their implications for education?" Looking at things whole—with the stereoscopic vision of the mind's eye—the answers were immediately clear. The first, crude statement was "Things are getting out of hand. We'd better get them back in hand." The second, more sophisticated statement became: *The major trend of the present age is to increase knowledge and power. The major problem is the widening gap between knowledge and power and our ability to control them. The major implication is that our learning to control knowledge and power must overtake our learning to increase knowledge and power.*

This statement raised other questions, and trying to answer them called for a unifying and guiding idea. I used the idea of dynamic balance, which has emerged in several fields and is elsewhere being generalized into a formal theory of systems. The idea of dynamic balance is developed in the first sections; succeeding sections then apply the idea to a set of questions. What does control mean? What does learning control involve? What is the relation between learning control and education? How might we regain control?

R. J. B.

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION vii

LOSS OF CONTROL 1

WHAT CONTROL MEANS 9

WHAT LEARNING CONTROL INVOLVES 11

LEARNING AND EDUCATION 15

THE ROLE OF THE ADULT IN THE TRANSMISSION OF CULTURE 23

THE ADULT AS PARENT 26

THE ADULT AS CITIZEN 28

THE ADULT AS A WORKER 33

THE ADULT IN HIS PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS 41

CONCLUSIONS 50

10

INTRODUCTION

In connection with a national study of adult education, we asked Robert Blakely for a statement on national trends and their impact on adult education. That paper, expanded at our request, is the imaginative and insightful essay printed in this volume.

Blakely discusses the increase in knowledge and power as the major trend of the present age. "The major problem," he says, "is the widening gap between knowledge and power and our ability to control them." He examines the concept of control, what it is, how it has been lost, how it may be exercised; he applies a formal theory of systems as a method of regaining control. To educators Blakely points out that control of power and knowledge is not a problem that can be dealt with in the formal education of young people, but rather is a challenge to continuing education of adults.

Robert Blakely is singularly well equipped to deal with the questions raised in this publication. As a former foundation executive who participated in the distribution of millions of dollars for liberal education programs for adults, he was closely involved in adult education but in a special, detached, almost "Jovian" relationship. Later, as an administrator of a state-wide university extension division, he acquired the experience of the actual operator of programs. And as a newspaper man and editorial writer—an early profession to which he has now returned—he learned to look at the contemporary milieu as a chronicler and critic of current events.

But Blakely, as adult educators who have heard his speeches and read his essays know, is also a poet and philosopher. To his knowledge and experience, therefore, he adds a vision of his own as a dramatic dimension of the analysis of the world and adult education that is the subject of this volume.

The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults is happy to be able to present to the field of adult education this latest and perhaps most provocative essay by Robert J. Blakely.

A. A. Liveright

LOSS OF CONTROL

Our purpose is to understand how knowledge and power have outstripped our ability to control them and how we might regain control. We need an approach that will enable us to look at many different things in many different ways. This essay will use the idea of systems.[1]

Systems: Dynamic Balances of Forces

In one sense, a system is the whole composed of its constituent units. In another sense, a system is a part of the environment of another system on the same level. Looked at in still another way, they may both be sub-systems of a yet larger system. This flexibility in the idea of a system enables us to avoid a false antithesis: the human being is neither a cell in a super-organism nor a sovereignty independent of other organisms, but an open system of, with, and in other open systems.

Again, looked at in one way, a system is the product of its past development. Looked at in another way, a system is a current equilibrium. Looked at in still another way, a system is the present state of future potentialities.

A system is a set of diverse units functioning as a whole. A living system is one that by its own activity maintains its internal and external relations in dynamic balance. According to this view, all of life is a hierarchy of dynamic systems. Each living system—cell, organ, organism, social organization—associates its constituents in relations more intimate than those that link it as a whole to the larger systems of which it is a part; yet each has wholeness only to a limited degree, and each is more, not less, itself because of its membership in larger systems. However, one important difference between an organism and an organization is that the individual person is the level at which human organizations operate. Only the individual thinks and feels.

---

[1] See General Systems, the yearbook of the Society for General Systems Research, the Mental Health Research Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Vols. I (1956) through IX (1964), especially Ludwig von Bertalanffy, "General Systems Theory," Vol. I, p. 1 (1956); and W. Ross Ashby, "General Systems Theory as a New Discipline," Vol. III, p. 1 (1958). See also Ludwig von Bertalanffy, Problems of Life (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960); Geoffrey Vickers, The Undirected Society (Toronto: 1959); and C. H. Waddington, The Ethical Animal (New York, 1961).

Development is a process of interaction. An individual is the interaction within the organism of new experiences with an ever-growing structure of past experiences. A society is the interaction of individuals with individuals. A country is the interaction of a people and their land. These processes are all linked and extended in time.

A living system, then, is a dynamic balance of forces, dependent for its continued existence on continually solving two problems that can never be solved once and for all: how to regulate the inner forces that make it a whole, and how to regulate the continual interaction between itself and its environment. Since the endurance of a system amid inner and outer changes is an improbable event, the regulative factor (not the energies which are regulated) deserves inquiry. Because a living system maintains itself by its own activities, the significant question is—What regulates behavior?

Enter, the Cultural System

"The human situation is characterized by an enormously important step in the evolution of the evolutionary mechanism. Indeed, it might not be unreasonable to define humanity by this fact. In man, the processes of teaching by the older members of the population and learning by the younger ones have been carried to an incomparably higher pitch than is found in any of the prehuman forms of life, where they play only a relatively minor role. . . . In man, they have developed not only to highly effective person-to-person learning, as in apprenticeship, but, by the invention of writing and other more recent devices, to an extremely elaborate system by which the whole conceptual understanding of the past is made available to present recruits to human society. We have here what in effect amounts to a new mode of hereditary transmission. . . . It may be referred to as the cultural system. Within the last few millenia, the human race has acquired capacities which in the non-human world could only have been obtained as the results of evolution. To give a banal example . . . what the development of flight was waiting for was not some change in the genetic system, but some change in the cultural system."[2]

---

[2] 2. Waddington, op. cit., 102-3.

Enter, Science-Technology

That change in the cultural system came with the rise of modern science, which may be described as a mutation in knowledge.[3] By its means, new ways of organizing the growth and the uses of knowledge at a more rapid rate and on a more secure basis than had been known before have developed.

A key notion by which science-technology expands knowledge and power is process. The principle of process is that how an entity (synonymously "occasion" or "event") becomes constitutes what the entity is.[4]

Scientists think in terms of the processes of becoming, not in terms of the fixities of being. Science is not a body of knowledge so much as a procedure for knowing.[5] Science-technology can determine what reality is, and it does so to the degree that it can understand and manipulate the process by means of which reality becomes; that degree is continually heightening, because knowledge and power are used each to increase itself and each to increase the other. Thus, science-technology grows according to the compound-interest principle.

Since it began in Europe about 1600, science-technology has been moving mankind into a new phase of evolutionary history, a shift that has been compared in importance to the previous shift from hunting-pastoral life to agricultural-urban life. It has started changes compounding and accelerating that, when charted as curves, began climbing sharply toward infinity after World War II.[6] Not precise measurement, but a sense that mankind is taking off is important. To feel the gravities of the takeoff, or blastoff, one need only look at the development of the digital computer, which, as a processor of information, extends man's intellect and, as a regulator of automated machines, extends his muscles and substitutes for his routine activities. Since the first electronic computer, ENIAC, in 1946, computer speeds have been increased by a factor of tens of thousands. An increase in the number of circuit-components by a factor of millions and the linking of computers into a utility-system are clearly in sight.[7] "We have the prospect before us, in the machines coming on the market in 1966 or 1967, of using the computer not as an abacus, but as a laboratory for the performance of experiments."[8]

---

[3] Since the focus of this paper is upon social consequences, it will often consider science and technology as a continuum. This is not to deny that for other purposes they are different. "Pure objective value-free science and the idea of man's universal domination over nature and history have come together, and it is not probable that this alliance will be broken. But it remains an alliance, it has not become a unity of fundamental values and outlook. Science stays pure, while technology uses and very often inspires disinterested research but keeps its basic interest in results. The scientist is not an engineer, the engineer is not a scientist, although they collaborate; they have been brought together."—Eric Weil, "Science in Modern Culture," Science and Culture, ed. Gerald Holton (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1965), 205-6.

[4] Alfred North Whitehead, Process and Reality (New York: Humanities Press, 1929), 33-35, 317-28.

[5] "The greatest invention of the nineteenth century was the invention of the method of invention. A new method entered into life. In order to understand our epoch, we can neglect all the details of change, such as railways, telegraphs, radios, spinning wheels, synthetic dyes. We must concentrate on the method itself; that is the real novelty, which has broken up the foundation of the old civilization. The prophecy of Francis Bacon has now been fulfilled; and man, who at times dreamt of himself as little lower than the angels, has submitted himself to become the servant and minister of nature. It still remains to be seen whether the same actor can play both parts."—Alfred North Whitehead, Science and the Modern World (New York: Macmillan Co., 1926), 141.

Science-technology is a continually and increasingly destabilizing force. Each of its phases sets in motion a sequence of changes that lead, not to a new stability, but to greater change. All human systems—from the person to the species—progressively lose their inner and outer dynamic balances upon which, at the least, healthy development and, at the most, continued existence depend.

In the next two sections we will look briefly at some of the major destabilizing effects of science-technology upon the larger and the smaller human systems—effects all too familiar to require documentation.

Destabilization of the Larger Systems

Population. Science-technology has brought about a decline in the death rate that has not been matched by a decline in the birth rate. In the world as a whole, population is increasing fastest in those regions that have the least margin above subsistence; the societies that have the most need to control population have the highest proportion of potential parents. In the United States, the highest increases are among those people most oppressed by race and poverty, both in the rural slums from which migrants come and in the urban slums into which they go. Every aspect of control to which we can point—whether it be the creation of a favorable climate of opinion, the adoption of government policies or the persuasion of individuals to change their most intimate beliefs and behavior—resolves itself into the task of teaching and learning. It is a task that grows larger the longer an adequate undertaking is postponed. Control is most needed by those who least know how to learn and whom we least know how to teach.

---

[6] See Kenneth Boulding, The Meaning of the Twentieth Century (New York, 1964), and Irving Kristol, "The Twentieth Century Began in 1945," The New York Times Magazine, May 2, 1965.

[7] Jan A. Rajchman, "The Shrinking Computer," The New York Times, May 23, 1965, section 11.

[8] Robert Jastrow and Albert Arking, "Superspeed Computers, A Major Tool in the Space Sciences," ibid., 29.

Economic Growth. Science-technology is the source of the perpetual economic growth that is required by continually rising populations, expectations, and standards of successful competition. The assets of economic growth and the liabilities of economic stagnation both compound. Thus the gap between the economically developed and the undeveloped nations is widening and will continue to widen, unless it is narrowed by long-term measures not now in sight. Similarly, within the United States the assets of social advantage and the liabilities of social disadvantage both compound; the gap between the socially and economically functional strata and the unfunctional strata is widening and will continue to widen, unless it is narrowed by long-term measures not now in sight. Every aspect of behavior—from those who could help to those who need help—resolves itself into a task of teaching and learning. The task magnifies with neglect. The needy are those whom we least know how to teach and who least know how to learn.

The Corruption of the Planet. On February 8, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson told Congress: "The modern technology, which has added much to our lives, can also have a darker side. Its uncontrolled waste products are menacing the world we live in, our enjoyment and our health. The air we breathe, our water, our soil and wildlife, are being blighted by the poisons and chemicals which are the by-products of technology and industry. . . . The same society which receives the rewards of technology must, as a cooperating whole, take responsibility for control."

The issue goes to the root questions, What is man and how is he related to nature? Is man nature's enemy, or are they partners in enduring symbiosis? These are philosophical and ethical, even religious questions, but they boil down to practical questions. In what physical conditions do we want to live? What are we prepared to give up in order to get and keep them? These questions will be answered, one way or another, by our behavior, individual and collective. We can refuse to pay the great price that saving, healing, cleansing, restoring, creating will cost, but we cannot escape paying the greater price that the refusal will cost. Technological man has yet to learn an "environmental ethic."

While some governments move to plan for at least the slowing down of the inadvertent corruption of the planet, at the same time more governments are speeding up the knowing corruption of the planet through the development and testing of nuclear bombs. This is the profoundest corruption of all, for it does not merely putrefy the earth's chemistry but it debases its nuclei. It makes malignant every breath of air, every swallow of water, every mouthful of food. It concentrates in the bones of the living and taints the previously inviolable genetic pools of the unborn.

War. The nation-state is a high-level step in the evolution of human organizations, but science-technology makes requirements for unity that far outpace the evolution. While science-technology progressively multiplies and constricts the bonds of interdependence, nations multiply, and each tends to seek its sovereign salvation through its own efforts and resources. Unrestrained war has become unendurable, yet no adequate alternative for resolving conflicts between nations has been developed. Destabilizing forces, such as runaway population, uneven economic growth, and competition for materials and sources of energy, make the creation of alternatives to war progressively more and more difficult. The nuclear arms race makes war progressively more probable, and the race is entering a new phase.

"With improvements in technology, the initial cost of nuclear weapons has been greatly reduced. Moreover, in many cases much of the development cost might be written off as chargeable to peaceful nuclear-power programs. Depending somewhat on whether or not defensive weapons are deployed, delivery systems may also become less costly. . . . All of which means that strategic nuclear-weapons systems could prove to be the great equalizer in international affairs that guns were in the case of individual combat. . . . The probability of nuclear weapons being used will almost certainly increase as the number of fingers on the trigger increases. Moreover, the increase in probability will be more than proportional to the increases in numbers."[9]

If and when a world political order on a scale equal to world interdependence is achieved, it will be accomplished in the way that loyalties and behavioral patterns have been enlarged in the past—through human learning, through the process of expanding the conceptions that human beings have of themselves. The adjustments that someday must replace war will depend upon the abilities of individual human beings to initiate, accept, and control changes. With this transition, let us consider some of science-technology's effects upon the individual.

Destabilization of the Smaller Systems[10]

Living Space. Science-technology progressively changes and restricts our living space. People and their activities increase but the surface of the earth does not. The commitment of land in the United States (we need look no farther afield) is largely unplanned. In the competition for land and its use, the most persistent casualties are those two primary social groups—the family and the neighborhood. The family is the means by which culture is transmitted, transmuted, and renewed; the neighborhood's innate social coherence formerly supported the development of coherent individuals. Science-technology is forcing society to make a new choice. It must deliberately control things that previously it could leave to their own self-maintaining processes—the air, the water, living space, the conditions for stable families and coherent neighborhoods—or it must renounce control of these things, accepting the consequences of their continuing deterioration.

Life and Livelihood. Science-technology divorces our social from our economic life. Some of the many inconsistencies between our social needs and our economic needs are so familiar that they can be suggested by single words or brief phrases: commuting, travel; shifts; staggered rest days, holidays, and vacations; working wives and mothers; changes of jobs and residence. We may reconcile the conditions of social and economic life in various ways, such as by refusing the demands of economic life when they become too disruptive, or by inventing and fostering new social patterns within the structures of economic life. We will do such things only to the extent that individually and collectively we deliberately choose to learn how to achieve and maintain the equivalents of conditions that in an integrated agricultural community we could take for granted. To the extent that we do not so choose, we must accept the consequences of continuing disintegration among the several aspects of our lives.

---

[9] William C. Foster, "Arms Control and Disarmament," Foreign Affairs, July 1965, 591.

[10] This section draws heavily on Vickers, op. cit.

Aspirations. Several factors in the American technological society tend to narrow the dimensions of status and success. Things tend to be done on an ever bigger scale and in more standardized ways. As power and things and money magnify, they tend to become ends in themselves. Business and industry invest large sums in the deliberate creation of new wants, no matter how artificial, and the calculated excitation of perpetual discontent. As it has raised its standards of living, American society has become more, rather than less, competitive. The more people who compete, the more people do not win, no matter how many "consolation prizes" may be offered. That many people seek to achieve status and success vicariously by identifying themselves with the winners is neither surprising nor healthful. The way to escape, or at least periodically to retreat, from the "great American rat race" is for individuals to create other dimensions of status and success by cultivating activities and enjoyments that are personally meaningful and intrinsically satisfying.

Expectations. Science-technology erodes the structure of expectations that underlies our sense of security and our power of foresight. "The importance of expectation in our lives can hardly be exaggerated. Social psychologists would even have us regard society as a structure of mutual expectations. All our moral values can be expressed in terms of what we expect of ourselves and each other. Both our effectiveness and our peace of mind depend very much on our being able to rely with some confidence on a running forecast of what is going to happen next. How much we depend on this ability we realize only when we lose it."[11]

To the extent that compounding changes undercut the grounds of past experience from which we project expectations, they reduce our individual effectiveness. To the extent that we are unable to hold an effective set of expectations in common, these changes impede our communications. To the extent that people whose expectations have been formed in different sub-cultures and cultures are required to live and work together in circumstances unfamiliar to them all, these changes strain the relations between groups. To the extent that they make the past of the old and the present of the young mutually incomprehensible, these changes strain the relations between the generations.

---

[11] Vickers, op. cit., 28.

Clearly there are limits to our abilities—personally and collectively—to assimilate change. These limits may be pushed back, but limits will remain, while science-technology's potentials for change are unlimited. Therefore, increasingly we must deliberately choose to control both the kind, rate, and direction of changes and our responses to them, or we must accept the consequences of progressive loss of control over ourselves and our lives.

Thus have all human systems—from the person to the species—progressively lost the inner and outer dynamic balances upon which, at the least, healthy development and, at the most, even existence depend.

WHAT CONTROL MEANS

Man has achieved controls in his relations with his non-human environment without achieving comparable controls in human relations. Western peoples, particularly Americans, are averse to the idea of control in human affairs. Science-technology developed first in a civilization that from its origins has put high value on the idea of freedom as a good in its own right and, more recently, as a means for progress. The idea of progress developed first in the West and put down its deepest roots in the New World. But the peoples of the West are being forced to think more deeply about both freedom and progress.

The growth of science-technology constricts the possibilities for freedom conceived as independence, which conception admits only of relationships being taken on and put off at will, like suits of clothing. Conversely, science-technology opens up both requirements and opportunities for freedom conceived as interdependence, a conception which regards relatedness as a part of the natures of both individuals and societies.

Similarly, the consequences of science-technology reveal inadequacies in the nineteenth-century idea of progress; for progress cannot be judged only in terms of expansion, which is merely the servant that makes progress possible. To be meaningful, progress must contribute to the idea of betterment, which is its goal and the criterion by which it is judged. But what is the better state to which we wish to progress? By itself, science-technology does not give us standards of betterment. To be maintained, progress requires stability as a condition. But by itself, science-technology destroys stability.

A third element in the American culture is the idea of equality. The consequences of science-technology are forcing the American people to think more deeply than before about what equality means and what its conditions are. These conditions now appear to be much more subtle and demanding than they had previously seemed.

The conditions for freedom, progress, and equality all require new controls. The choice is not between controls and no controls, but between kinds of control: between controls imposed by blind forces and self-control.

The government of living systems is the regulation of the organization of "self" so as to maintain its coherence, which is its life, and to direct its course, which is its development. By inventing the cultural method of transmitting acquired characteristics, man became responsible for the characteristics he acquired—that is, for the evolution of his self. With the "invention of the method of invention" that is transforming the cultural system, man must now become the conscious architect of his self.

William James's Psychology indicates how the individual can achieve the higher order of self-consciousness and self-awareness called for. He identified two "discriminated aspects" of self-awareness—the knowing I and the known Me. The Me is made up of the material me, the social me, and the spiritual me—each arousing feelings of self-estimation and prompting acts of self-seeking. The I "is a thought at each moment different from that of the last moment, but appropriative of the latter, together with all that the latter called his own."[1]

---

[1] "The Self," Psychology (Cleveland: Fine Editions Press, 1948), 176-216.

At every stage in the process of self-becoming, there is room for self-direction. There is room for choice concerning which constituents of past me's are appropriated. There is room, too, for choice in the stream of consciousness, the knowing I, that appropriates. There is room for guidance by an ideal of the self one would become.

This margin for choice may not be wide at any time and at times may not exist. But whether self-government is possible in the vertiginous stream we have deeply entered will turn upon whether large numbers of persons use whatever margin of choice they may have, consciously and persistently, to direct their personal developments and to participate in the direction of the evolution of their kind.

"'Will you or won't you have it so?' is the most probing question we are ever asked; we are asked it every hour of the day, and about the largest as well as the smallest, the most theoretical as well as the most practical, things. We answer by consents or non-consents and not by words. What wonder that these dumb responses should seem our deepest organs of communication with the nature of things! What wonder if the effort demanded by them be the measure of our worth as men! What wonder if the amount which we accord of it were the one strictly underived and original contribution which we make to the world."[2]

WHAT LEARNING CONTROL INVOLVES

Values

In James's analysis, values are the quality in the stream of thought that moves the I to "care paramountly for" certain parts of remembered experience and to appropriate them to the Me's and to make the effort "to have it or not have it so." The sharp question, "What matters most?" is the fulcrum for choice. Our "dumb responses" of "consents and non-consents" every hour of the day are influenced by what we seek and what we shun, by what we think are goods and bads and how we rank them. Cultural anthropologists regard an integrating system of values as almost an abstract synonym for a culture as a whole. Similarly an integrating system of values can be regarded as almost an abstract synonym for a person as a whole. In both person and society, therefore, learning for control must be oriented to a concern for values.

---

[2] Ibid., 460. James, of course, was before psychiatry but he contributed to the development of studies of personality and human relations. His ideal of the "willing self," expanding consciousness into realms of which it is unconscious and unaware, seems consistent with psychoanalysts' ideal of the "healthy mind," which is formulated in terms of the ego's absorbing as much as possible of the id and the super-ego. It is, moreover, more usefully clear than the psychiatric concepts as they are employed by laymen.

It is precisely in regard to the orienting values that science-technology most needs to be complemented by other ways of knowing and doing. One would be hard put to say that technology has a value system, unless it is Thrasymachus' "will of the stronger." Science, of course, has its own value system, revolving around truth, but truth is only one kind of value and scientific truth is only one kind of truth.[1] Modern natural science works hard to exclude the last of Aristotle's four aspects of the answer to the question "Why?"—the final cause—"the end, or that for the sake of which a thing is done." To guard against subjectivity in objective study is, of course, fundamental, but trying to exclude human aspiration from the study of mankind must rank among the silliest foibles of the human mind.

A large part of self-understanding must come from learning how to be more objective in the sense of seeing ourselves as others see us, seeing others as they see themselves, and submitting pride to the discipline of agreed-upon and tested procedures. But another, large part of self-understanding must come from inner experiences, where values dwell.

---

1. "Science is value-free, though it is based on values, among which, paradoxically enough, freedom from value judgments is one of the first; and life is directed by values. Science has shaped our natural and social surroundings and goes on doing so; without disinterested science, mastery over nature and history would be impossible. And science has no means to tell us what we are to do with this mastery, nor whether it is good or bad in itself. If there were an answer, it would establish unity; but it would not be given by science. Popular opinion is wrong when it looks upon scientists as the successors of the sages of old. To consider science as the universal measuring rod for values is an unscientific ideology; when a scientist answers a question in the field of values, he is speaking not as a man of science, but as an ordinary believer, citizen, moral subject, although his schooling may—sometimes—help him to be more consistent and clearheaded than his neighbors."—Weil, op. cit., 212.

Science is neutral at best, and sinister at worst, unless it is the servant of compassion.

The valuing of truth in personal and social living; the valuing of several kinds of truth, public and private; the valuing of several kinds of goods; the valuing of a way of life that respects multiple goods and multiple truths--these are different ways of saying that concern for values is the crux of learning self-control. The question then becomes one of criteria for valuation. The self should appropriate that which is appropriate. That is, it should make its own what is fitting. What is fitting can be judged only in context. This leads to the second major element in learning self-control.

Relationships and Wholes

Alfred North Whitehead stated the dangers of the situation in which effective knowledge is professionalized knowledge and professionalized knowledge is narrow knowledge:

> . . . the specialized functions of the community are performed better and more progressively, but the generalized direction lacks vision. The progressiveness in detail only adds to the danger produced by the feebleness of coordination.
>
> This criticism of modern life applies throughout, in whatever sense you construe the meaning of a community. It holds if you apply it to a nation, a city, a district, an institution, a family, or even to an individual. There is a development of particular abstractions, and a contraction of concrete appreciation. The whole is lost in one of its aspects . . . the novel pace of progress requires a greater force of direction if disasters are to be avoided. The point is that the discoveries of the nineteenth century were in the direction of professionalism, so that we are left with no expansion of wisdom and with greater need for it.
>
> Wisdom is the fruit of a balanced development. It is this balanced growth of individuality which it should be the aim of education to secure. The most useful discoveries for the immediate future would concern the furtherance of this aim without detriment to the necessary intellectual professionalism.[2]

The last sentence poses the problem, which cannot be avoided simply on the grounds that it is difficult. Man has always had to do the best he could to grapple with the relationships and whole that affected him. He must continue to do so—with a wider system of relationships and a more complex hierarchy of wholes to try to comprehend, but also with new concepts and instruments to help him.

---

[2] Science and the Modern World, 283-84.

Process and the Compound-Interest Principle

Science-technology determines what reality is and does so to the extent that it can understand and manipulate how reality becomes; learning to control must also enter fully into the flow of process. Process-learning involves such factors as an attitude that regards reality as a perpetual perishing and a perpetual becoming, attention to procedures of knowing rather than to bodies of fact, and concern with the relationships of elements that underlie temporary configurations.[3]

Science-technology expands at a compounding rate because knowledge and power, alone and reciprocally, are used to increase themselves. And learning to control must also compound. Compounding learning begins with an attitude that regards learning as a way to profit from experience. It proceeds by investing returns from learning into resources for learning. This is appropriation in both senses—making one's own and committing to future purposes. Even if one's capacity to learn is not enlarged, one can learn more efficient ways of using what one has learned in order to learn more and more rapidly. That is, one learns to learn and perhaps can even learn how to improve learning to learn.[4] Above all, the compounding of learning must meet the requirement of all compounding that becomes significant: continuation. Stopped, it not only ceases to grow; it ceases to be a process. Continued long enough, no matter how small the rate, a compounding process reaches a point at which it begins to rise sharply.

* * *

The control of knowledge and power through learning (1) values; (2) relationships and wholes; (3) processes; and (4) how to compound learning—these are requirements inherent in the predicament of modern man. Together they point to a new conception of learning. Before we try to give statement to that conception, let us consider the relation between learning and education.

---

[3] See Lancelot L. Whyte, Accent on Form (New York: Harper and Row, 1954); and Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961).

[4] See Gregory Bateson, "Social Planning and the Concept of Deutero-learning," Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion, Second Symposium (New York: Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion and Their Relations to the Democratic Way of Life, Inc., 1942), 81.

LEARNING AND EDUCATION

The basic tension of the present age is the contradiction between those components of our culture that remain imitative of the past and those components that have become inventive of the future. Modern society is thus a centaur—with the legs and body of an imitative horse and the hands and head of an inventive man.

As a field of institutions and practices, American education is also a centaur. Most American schooling is the imparting of fixed bodies of knowledge, not the initiation of processes of knowing. Most research conducted in American educational institutions ignores the problem of how new knowledge is to be disseminated generally and translated into the wise governing of private and public affairs. Thus American education reflects the basic tension of the American society and heightens the strain.

That most American schooling is the imparting of fixed bodies of knowledge, not the initiation of processes of knowing, is attested by its content, which is "subject matter." It is attested by its structure, which is a mechanical architecture of units and unit-hours built into certificates and degrees—specie of work "completed." It is attested by its reflexive responses to the challenges of increasing complexity and quickening change, which is to prescribe more of the same: more courses and more years, thereby prolonging the students' period of cultural incubation. It is attested most convincingly, perhaps, by the status of "adult education." Most adult education conducted by formal educational institutions is treated as a subordinate activity and regarded as inferior education—a "going back," a "making up," instead of evidence that the process of learning is operating.

That most American research conducted in educational institutions ignores the problem of how to disseminate new knowledge widely and incorporate it into the lives of people generally is attested by the supreme position that university research enjoys in the educational hierarchy. It is attested by the trend toward obscurity and, indeed, prideful incomprehensibility in language. It is attested by the fact that research into the specialized subject matter of "communications" is replacing preparation for the professional practice of communication in American schools of journalism, which ought to be providing the mass media with broadly skillful reporters and interpreters.[1]

Since American education is the reflection, not the origin, of the contradiction in the American society between the imitative and the inventive components of its culture, it would be unrealistic to look to American education as the origin of the resolution of the conflict. Where, then, should we look? What are the most promising approaches to learning how to control knowledge and power? Let us return to the four requirements identified in the preceding section.

Values

The problem of learning values can be stated in terms of ethics, because human beings express their valuations in their conduct, and ethics are the evaluation of conduct. When we ask, "How are ethics formed and developed?" we see immediately that there are strict limits to what American formal education, even at its best, can do.

The English professor of animal genetics, C. H. Waddington, sees ethical development in three stages, which he bases on research findings concerning human development. First, "the human infant is born with probably a certain innate capacity to acquire ethical beliefs but without any specific beliefs in particular. During the first few months of life, processes go on by which these innate potentialities become realized. The infant becomes moulded into the sort of being who, we may say, 'goes in for' having ethical beliefs." Second, "explicit ethical beliefs . . . gradually become formulated and accepted or rejected from the time of, say, middle childhood onwards for a varying period into our more adult life." Third, there are the "processes in which a man examines his own ethical beliefs in relation to general systems of thought—for instance, philosophical or scientific thought—which may themselves carry little or none of the specific quality to which the name ethical is given. In so far as he then accepts some and rejects other ethical beliefs, he will be applying what might be called a supra-ethical criterion. This, which I [refer] to as 'the general good' or 'the ethical system of general validity' is the type of criterion which I [refer] to as 'wisdom.'"[2]

---

[1] See John Tebbel, "What's Happening to Journalism Education?" Saturday Review, October 10, 1964, pp. 103-4, 109, and his piece by the same title, ibid., October 12, 1963, pp. 52-53. "The journalism educators, who have lived in the academic darkness for so long, scorned by their colleagues of the traditional discipline as trade school practitioners (although no one thinks to apply the term to the law schools or medical schools), have found in the sociology of journalism a royal road to respectability. On the graduate level, this road also leads to lucrative income from government and industry for research projects . . . there seems to be little doubt that in the end the sociologist will win, that journalism faculties will eventually be composed of Ph.D. specialists in communications, and that the study of communications processes will overshadow everything else in the curriculum, if indeed it does not eliminate the 'trade school' courses."

Formal education begins well after a person's valuating potentialities have become realized in specific valuations, and it usually ends well before a person's mature experiences permit him to evaluate his valuations. And during this midpassage, formal education is only one—and probably far from the most influential—medium through which valuations are accepted or rejected. Therefore, for advances in learning and inculcating ethics and other values that are appropriate to the world of science-technology, we must look, not primarily to the schools, but to the adults who make the home, the church, the neighborhood; those who govern the community and its institutions, of which the school is only one, and who create the environing culture, including the media of mass communications.

Relationships and Wholes

"Wisdom is the fruit of balanced development," Whitehead said. "It is this balanced growth of individuality which it should be the aim of education to secure. The most useful discoveries for the immediate future would concern the furtherance of this aim without detriment to the necessary intellectual professionalism." Where are these discoveries most likely to be made?

One can confidently say that they need not be sought in the attempt to teach generalized knowledge to children and youths. The mind forgets or remembers imperfectly, or what it remembers is disproven, inappropriate, or inadequate. But an even more basic shortcoming of mere generalized knowledge is that a person does not know what it means *to know* if he does not know something specially; he does not know the procedures, the complexities, the qualifications, the tentativeness, the everlasting cost in time and effort. The alternative we are seeking to develop to the sharp narrow person is not the "well-rounded" hollow person who lacks both point and pith—a balloon-like satellite who circles the globe every hour and a half, echoing or relaying messages that others originate.

---

[2] Waddington, *op. cit.*, 25-26.

Relationships and wholes cannot be memorized. They must be experienced and lived and thereby appropriated. The alternative to the sharp narrow person is the person with breadth of understanding and length of perspective sharpened to a point of particular application. The most promising explorations of how to marry the balanced growth of individuality with the necessary intellectual professionalism are being carried out by some professional schools and professional organizations.

Some professional schools are recognizing that a point has been reached beyond which narrow knowledge ceases to be effective knowledge. Therefore, they are trying to give their students a larger comprehension of principles, structures, and methods as scope for their professional grasp.[3]

Some professional schools and professional organizations are recognizing that a point has been reached beyond which a static competence ceases to be a competence. Therefore, they are co-operatively offering to their practicing members systematic opportunities for continuing their post-professional education, and those persons most deeply engaged—as mutual teachers and learners—are the most capable members of the faculties and professions.

---

[3] "The history of professional education in the United States strongly suggests that the occupational groups which have most recently turned to institutions of higher education for the formal education of their future members, such as the physical therapists, actuaries, and medical technologists, could profit greatly by observing the developments in the older professions. The experience of the latter clearly shows that the social status and the general competence of their members have been enhanced by the adoption of educational programs which emphasize broad principles and a general education for the varied responsibilities of life. Contrary to a view among some members of the newer professional groups, they will not gain prestige and a separate identity by multiplying units of highly specialized, technical instruction of limited applicability. Curricula in some professional schools, composed of narrow, highly specialized and technical subject matter, could be improved by a reduction of such courses, by an increase in the liberal arts and sciences, and by offering core courses in the professional field stressing principles rather than details of fact and technique. If such a reorientation occurs, graduates will not only fulfill their professional responsibilities more effectually; they will also more fully understand and discharge their duties as citizens and they will live a richer personal life. The profession as a whole will gain the enhanced social and economic status and greater opportunity for civic leadership which have invariably accompanied the raising of educational standards."—Earl J. McGrath, Liberal Education in the Professions (New York: Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959), 34.

We have already moved from the second of the four requirements for learning to control knowledge and power—learning relationships and wholes—to the third and fourth—the learning process, and learning to compound learning. We do not need to develop further the latter two; they are the time-dimension of learning relationships and wholes. Indeed, all four factors are a functioning system: in the continuous process of learning, the mature person, motivated by values, moves through the forms of relationships and wholes. And his learning is compounded.

It is the condition of the mature person—with its full freedoms and responsibilities—not the dependent condition of the immature person—that makes fully possible the learnings required to control knowledge and power. Only through the conscious exercise of knowledge and power can the control of knowledge and power be learned.

The developments we have noted toward continuous learning in the most demanding and advanced specialities, indicate an approach that is open to all persons in all specialized fields. In our age of increasing specialization, this designation includes all socially effective persons. The psychology of learning is common to us all—to move from the center of self along paths of relevant concern in a widening spiral that enlarges the self. Robert Redfield, who defined an educated person as "one who is at work on his enlargement," told how the enlarging spiral unfolds:

> In . . . The Aims of Education, A. N. Whitehead describes the education of children and young people as a movement of the mind from freedom through discipline to freedom again. The mind begins in a phase of imaginative discovery of experience. There is a free ranging of thought and appreciation. This is the first of the three periods which Whitehead sees. It corresponds with the first twelve years or so of life and with primary education. It is followed, he tells us, by a stage of precision, corresponding with secondary education, in which additional facts are put into systematic order. And this is followed by a mature stage, ordinarily begun in higher education, where again there is freedom to range but in which, now, general ideas are entertained under control of the discipline that has been acquired.
>
> Here I look not at the sequence of stages in the mental growth and schooling of the young, but at the mind's movement in any educational experience, brief or long, in young or old. I am thinking of how you and I add to our education, now, in any effort of the kind that we may make. . . . As Whitehead sees a cycle, I, too, see a cycle. . . . I see a movement of the mind that begins as a free reaching outward, impelled by curiosity, wonder, excitement. I see the mind next pass through a sort of contest, a conversation of alternatives or between

31

> this event and that idea, in difficult and fruitful interaction. And then, if education happens, there is a third phase of the cycle in which the new fact or idea or experience is made a part of me; I act, internally, with regard to it.
>
> For [this third aspect of the educational experience], the word "participation" might be used to suggest the sharing of the act of learning by both teacher and student, or the part that is taken by the reader of a book in the ideas of the book. The word "incorporation" might emphasize the way in which something learned is built into one's self. And "application" points to that involvement of learning in the life of action with our fellows. . . . But I choose the word "creation," because man is a maker, and the making of his better self, through learning, is the end of that activity which I am . . . examining. It is by trying to make something which we feel to be part of us and yet something which we can give to another, that we make ourselves.[4]

We are now in a position at least to suggest the new conception of learning that the requirements of the scientific-technological age point to. It is everybody learning from everybody else and everything throughout his life.[5] This statement is too formless to be useful, except to throw into contrast the limitations of the old conception that identifies education with schooling and schooling with one aspect of a person's life from, say, six to twenty-two years, after the crucial formative years of infancy and before the crucial forming decades of maturity. Let us try then to give our statement more form.

Regarding man's cultural system as a new kind of evolutionary mechanism that transmits acquired characteristics, we can distinguish two ways by which such characteristics can be acquired: through assimilating knowledge accumulated in the past and through sharing knowledge discovered in the present. What a genetical system transmits to a new organism before it is born is comparable to what a cultural system transmits to a

---

4. "The Educational Experience," The Redfield Lectures (Pasadena: The Fund for Adult Education, 1955), 13-14, 45.

5. Compare "A Redefinition of Education," by Margaret Mead, NEA Journal, October, 1959: "We are no longer dealing primarily with the vertical transmission of the tried and true by the old, mature, and experienced teacher to the young, immature, and inexperienced pupil in the classroom. This was the system of education developed in a stable, slowly changing culture. By itself, vertical transmission of knowledge no longer adequately serves the purposes of education in a world of rapid change. What is needed and what we are already moving toward is the inclusion of another whole dimension of learning: the lateral transmission, to every sentient member of society, of what has just been discovered, invented, created, manufactured, or marketed. This need for lateral transmission exists no less in the classroom and laboratory than it does on the assembly line with its working force of experienced and raw workmen."

new human being before he is mature; this latter we may call hereditary-cultural learning. What a non-human animal learns after it is born is comparable to what a human being learns after he is mature; this latter we may call adaptive-cultural learning. In a cultural sense, a human being is not hatched until he has acquired enough hereditary-cultural learning to be accepted as a fully functioning adult. Then he enters into freedoms and responsibilities that give him opportunities to acquire adaptive-cultural learning not available to him in his social-embryonic period.

Regarding science-technology as a mutation in the cultural mechanism, we can identify a third type of learning, which we may call inventive-cultural. This new type is so effective that it requires changes in the other two types.

It requires that hereditary-cultural learning be oriented toward the future. Until recently, hereditary-cultural learning could be oriented toward the past on the assumption that the future would be recognizably similar to the past. This assumption is now considered false. Hereditary-cultural learning oriented to the future would stand consciously on the expectation that the future will be different from the past. It would use the past, not as a model, but as an analog. It would not imitate but forecast. It would not try to outfit a young person with all the freight of knowledge (much of it not yet discovered) he will need throughout his life. It would try to keep alive and foster the young person's innate desire to know, to give him dynamic balance, to set him in the right attitude and direction and to equip him with the tools and skills that would enable him to "live off the land"—that is, to acquire adaptive-cultural learning for his various purposes—the rest of his life.

The high development of inventive-cultural learning further requires that adaptive-cultural learning become vastly more important as a regulatory function in the lives of mature individuals and in the operations of the society than it now is. Continuous learning would become a conscious and purposeful activity of all adults, their organizations, and society.

Only as parents, teachers, and governors (in the larger sense) gradually creating a fully adaptive culture will adults be able to transmit to children and youths a hereditary culture that is oriented to the future. As the change advances, the movements between the generations will be increasingly reciprocal. But it is unrealistic to expect adults who are themselves static intellectually to produce children who are adaptive and inventive.

As these changes are made, the test of education will become, not how much young people have learned by the time they are mature, but how effectively they use learning as a function during their mature decades. The society and its organizations will recognize that continuous learning is a process whose maintenance is as essential to individual and corporate well-being as the physical health of the adult members is, and that continuous learning is a constituent as integral to effective operation as continuous modernization of equipment and methods. The concept of research and development will be expanded to include provisions to disseminate the new knowledge and to provide opportunities for adults to learn how to control the consequences of its application.

Only by making these changes—the reorientation of our hereditary-cultural learning from the past to the future and the vast expansion and improvement of our adaptive-cultural learning—will we resolve the basic tension of the modern age, which is between those components of our culture that have become inventive of the future in one direction, and in the other, those components that remain imitative of the past.

In fact, these changes are already under way. We have noticed the knife-edge developments in some of the professions. The same developments of continuous learning are in process in other large areas, including industry, labor unions, government, and the armed forces.

Some of the most effective and important systematic programs of adult learning are not called, or even thought of as, adult education. This fact, heavy with portent, means that continuing learning is coming to be regarded—not like physical exercises that one takes grimly, if at all, in order to correct deficiencies or to "keep in shape"—but as a natural function essential to the command and enjoyment of one's affairs.

* * *

The import of this review of the relation between learning and education is that the most important developments for the future are not in the field of formal education for children and young people but are in the largely unformed and often despised field of continuing self-learning by adults. It seems inherent in the evolutionary process that the emerging forms which will inherit the future look unimpressive compared to the highly developed forms they are to supersede.

In one sense, the change to a new conception of learning now under way is a return—a recognition in a new form of the timeless human fact that the world is run by adults.

THE ROLE OF THE ADULT IN THE TRANSMISSION OF CULTURE

Recent studies of human development, which are consistent with earlier studies, indicate that the individual human being is to a high degree set—in personality, characteristics, and outlook—during the first few years, even months of life. From this, the inference is sometimes made, usually not quite so explicitly, that adults should, therefore, be neglected because they are hopelessly "stable" (read "frozen").

The balanced inferences that should be drawn are those that Margaret Mead has stated: "The comparative science of character formation demonstrates the dependence of the child upon the culture which is mediated to it by those who handle it in infancy, and the absolute dependence, therefore, of any cultural system upon those who transmit it."[1] Recent studies of human development stress the dependence of the child upon the culture but neglect the "absolute dependence, therefore, of any cultural system upon those who transmit it." An example of such neglect is Stability and Change in Human Characteristics by Benjamin S. Bloom.[2]

"For selected characteristics there is a negatively accelerated curve of development which reaches its midpoint before 5. We have reasoned that the environment would have its greatest effect on a characteristic during the period of its most rapid development."[3] "The developments at one period are in part determined by the earlier developments and in turn influence and determine the nature of later developments . . . the developments that take place in the early years are crucial to all that follows."[4] "Less and less change is likely in a group or in an individual as the curve of development of a characteristic reaches a virtual plateau."[5]

---

[1] "The Comparative Study of Culture and the Purposive Cultivation of Democratic Values," Science, Philosophy and Religion, Second Symposium, 56-68.

[2] New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

At the same time that Dr. Bloom's and similar studies confirm the dependence of the child upon the culture, they also confirm Dr. Mead's succeeding statement of "the absolute dependence, therefore, of any cultural system upon those who transmit it." Yet, while the researchers pessimistically conclude that little can be done to change adults (or for them to change themselves?), they paradoxically expect that somehow adults will find out about and act wisely in terms of their findings.

For example, Dr. Bloom's two concluding paragraphs are:

> All these matters point up the need for increased social responsibility. If school dropouts, delinquent behavior, and frustration with the educational requirements of a society can be predicted long in advance, can we sit idly by and watch the prophecies come true? If remedial actions and therapy are less effective at later stages in the individual's development, can we satisfy a social conscience by indulging in such activities when it is far too late? When the school environment is at variance with the home and peer group environment, can we find ways of reconciling these different environments?
>
> Put briefly, the increased ability to predict long-term consequences of environmental forces and developmental characteristics places new responsibilities on the home, the school and the society. If these responsibilities are not adequately met, society will suffer in the long run. If these responsibilities are neglected, the individual will suffer a life of continual frustration and alienation. The responsibilities are great, the tasks ahead are difficult, and only through increased understanding of the interrelations between environments and individual development will we be able to secure more adequate solutions.[6]

---

[3] Ibid., 214. The list of characteristics includes the following, with the age "at which one-half of the criterion variance can be predicted" (that is, one-half of the development): general intelligence, age 4; agressiveness in males, age 3; dependence in females, age 4; intellectuality in males and females, age 4; general school achievement, grade 3.

[4] Ibid., 215.

[5] Ibid., 218.

[6] Ibid., 231.

One would, therefore, expect the conclusion that the behavioral sciences should turn at least equal attention to the problems of how to disseminate knowledge about human development to adults, who make up those abstractions "the home, the school, and the society," and how to motivate them to take up the new responsibilities that are placed upon them. Yet Dr. Bloom's conclusion is otherwise: "In this writer's opinion, the most vital research problems in the behavioral sciences are those centered around the effects of early learning and early environments on humans."[7]

Vital, yes. But most vital? We need to know more about the effects of early learning and early environment on humans, yes. But who is "we"? And what does "knowing" mean? Who puts to good use in developing human beings what is known and what will become known about human development? How will the users learn it? How will they learn how to use it?

While the adult has less capacity to change than the child, the adult has a margin for freedom that the child does not have. This margin of adult freedom—however narrow or wide it may be—holds all our chances for controlling the compounding forces that this paper has sketched—for minimizing their damages, for avoiding their destruction, for putting to human good the potentialities that science-technology holds.

Knowledge and power do not exist in the abstract. Knowledge is what individuals know. Power is what individuals and groups have. The questions about the control of power and knowledge are whether the right people know the right things in the right places at the right times and do the right things with their knowledge.

The American people are committed to democracy—committed both in the sense of being pledged and in the sense of being confined. We have no alternative. Our history shows that belief in democracy is what holds us together, and that we would fall apart if it were lost. Our history and the history of other peoples show that, as Winston Churchill said, "Democracy is the worst possible form of government—except any other form."

Pledged and confined, we must make democracy work. It can work only through a vast and rapid expansion and improvement of learning by the adults who govern themselves and the nation. The next four sections will identify some of the key problems of learning for the adult in his several roles and systems.

---

[7] Ibid., 216.

THE ADULT AS A PARENT

If the individual human being is to a high degree set in personality, fixed in characteristics and oriented in outlook during the first few years—even the first few months—of life, then no other learning is so important as learning how to be a good parent. Bloom concludes: "In our society, it is likely that agreement might be secured on characteristics which enable the individual to adapt to a rapidly changing society as well as those which enable the individual to secure some measures of happiness in his life."[1] After considering several statements of such characteristics and the environmental conditions favorable to them, he goes on:

> What is being suggested here is that more desirable child-rearing environmental conditions can be identified and implemented in the twentieth century. Such environmental conditions can be approached from a behavioral science research point of view and there is every likelihood that at least the minimal conditions for healthy development can be determined. The reader, who may be appalled by a formulation of the desirable conditions for child rearing, will find that throughout history each society or culture has had clearly specified sets of child-rearing conditions and appropriate procedures and circumstances for child rearing were taught from one generation to another. It is only in the last half century that parents have rejected traditional approaches and have been cut off from a set of procedures which assure each parent that he is utilizing the "correct methods." The sale of "how to do it" child care booklets testifies to the need parents feel for guidance and reassurance in this area. Perhaps in the future we will find the task of being a mother or father requires far more training and preparation than has been commonly recognized. How-to-do-it booklets are not sufficient training for this complex task.[2]

The clear implication is that the most important learners are not the population in the schools from, say, six to twenty-five, but the par-

---

1. Ibid., 227.
2. Ibid., 229.

ents and their children in the home, and the most important purpose of learning is not for fulfilling economic functions, but for developing human beings.

Vickers recognizes this implication. "If it is right for a society to pay more regard to some classes of its members than to others, those with the greatest claim on its attention would seem to be the children and their parents—more particularly the age groups between birth and say fifteen and between say twenty-five and forty—the children, because what is laid down in them will endure to the good or ill of them and their children also; the older group because they are probably far more important as parents than they will ever be as producers."[3] Considering the ages when young people get married and have children and the need to prepare for marriage and parenthood, the ten years between fifteen and twenty-five should also be included.

A vision arises, then, of a society that focuses major attention upon the family—the means whereby its culture is passed on and modified, the major point where individual and social experiences interact—during the entire forty years of the cycle of the generations. We will almost certainly move to realize this vision as the destabilizing effects of science-technology accelerate and as we become more generally aware of the implications of the facts of human development that research is showing. It will be a deliberate attempt to reverse a trend that has been occurring through neglect—the family's abdication of its functions to the schools, which, of course, are unable to assume them.

Looking at the role of parent with regard to the adult, no other role is so rich in what Robert J. Havighurst calls "the teachable moment." "Certain developmental tasks come with great urgency to a person during a relatively short period of time. At this time one's motive to learn is intense, and education is extremely effective."[4] Moreover, the developmental task of learning to be a good parent is as wide and deep as life itself.

The Adult as Surrogate Parent

Dr. Bloom was probably correct in assuming that some of his readers would be "appalled by the formulation of desirable conditions for child rearing" and undoubtedly many Americans would be appalled at the prospects of a systematic social program of taking a large number of babies completely away from their parents as soon after birth as their home environments are judged to be hopeless and of subjecting an even larger number of babies and children as early as possible to other conditions designed to counteract undesirable home conditions. Such prospects seem like prescriptions taken from Plato's Republic rather than from "The Declaration of Independence." Yet they loom clearly before the American people.

---

[3] Vickers, op. cit., 70.

[4] Adult Education and Adult Needs (Chicago: CSLEA, 1956), 34.

For a large segment of the American people, by no means all Negro, the family structure has broken down. The breakdown continues and spreads. How can the American people salvage the children who can be saved, repair the damage that can be repaired, halt and reverse the breakdown? What new kinds of agencies do we need to invent? Who will staff them? What will they do? How will they learn to do it? American adults face a huge, strange developmental task of learning and innovation. To perform it successfully, they must give of their best selves. The responsibility will be closer to their roles as parents than to their roles as citizens.

Whether as parents, surrogate parents, or citizens, American adults face a choice; either passively to accept the deterioration of the family until it is little more than a reproductive unit, or actively to reconstitute it into a center where all its members—immature and mature—learn to develop the best of their human potentialities.

THE ADULT AS A CITIZEN

The affairs of the world will be governed, one way or another, for good or for ill; and what the individual person does, or does not do, matters. In fact, it is all that matters, because all human organizations operate on the level of the individual person. When November 22, 1963, dawned in Dallas, Texas, John Fitzgerald Kennedy and Lee Harvey Oswald were operating on the same level—the level of self. The difference between the two men that mattered was in their concepts of their selves. The man of unreason, who could not govern himself, destroyed the man of reason, who governed the most powerful nation on earth; and the billions of human beings who make up the human race, each of whom operates on the level of self, became terrifyingly aware of their interdependence.

Self-government depends on individuals who are responsible for their own coherence and direction and who have a large enough sense of self to assume co-operative responsibility for the coherence and direction of the many systems through which they are related. As more and more people become more and more interdependent, the citizen's responsibilities multiply and become both more intimate and more far reaching. Therefore, he must learn continually to expand his sense of self in space, time, and humanity. Participating in self-government gives him opportunities so to learn.

Democracy is a superior form of government because it gives to all people the educative freedom and responsibility to discover and develop their capacities through taking part in deciding and creating what they should do and become, individually and together. It matters very much to an individual whether he is enlarging his humanness by playing his role as a citizen in the conduct of public affairs.

At times it is hard for a citizen to see that what he does or does not do makes a difference in the conduct of public affairs—particularly during moments of critical decisions, when even the heads of states may feel helpless. But it is easy to see that the sum total of individual and collective decisions and actions create conditions that make the difference between whether crises do or do not arise or between whether a crisis is constructively or destructively resolved.

All the consequences of science-technology are testing the ability of the American people to learn to expand their sense of space, time, and humanity. Here we may illustrate by considering the widening gaps between the economically developed and the economically undeveloped nations and between the economically functional and the economically nonfunctional strata in the American nation.

The basic cause for both these widening gaps is the same: Science-technology is diminishing the bargaining power of both the undeveloped nations and the non-functional strata, and present prospects hold further diminution of power. Undeveloped nations face competition with one another, with overpopulation and with the development of synthetic substitutes for what they have to sell. Non-functional people in the United States face competition with each other, with increasing numbers of functional people, and with the development of automation.

American programs of aid to undeveloped nations have not succeeded in lessening the gap between us and something different is called for. This something different, to have any chance to succeed, must be undertaken in its own right. For those peoples' own sake, and in their conditions, not as an instrument for furthering other purposes, such as American foreign or economic or military or business policies. This will require from the American people and their leaders a larger sense of self—in space, time, and humanity—than any people has ever demonstrated before. It will require the deepest commitment and the utmost skill from those who go to help the undeveloped people. It will require that these peoples learn how to use the help. The most important help they need is in learning.

The American people have fairly recently discovered poverty in the midst of their affluent society, and they have begun to understand the nature of the problem. It is not just that many people are poor; money cures poorness, and we have money. It is that many people have no economic function and this state can be cured only by enabling them to do something that the society will pay to have done. What do they need to learn in order to have function? How can they learn it? How can we teach them? What do we need to learn in order to teach them? How can we learn it? One question leads to another, and when they are explored they raise deeper and deeper questions about the sick social and personal conditions in which the non-functional people live. When corrective measures are considered, they are seen to call for more and more fundamental reforms of American life. The American people are just beginning to trace out some of these threads.

Although its roots lie deeper, the problem of a separation in the body of American society is complicated by racial prejudice. Although its sources and ramifications are everywhere in our country, one of its concentrations is in the central city of the great metropolis. Although solutions must be sought through all levels of government and in all communities, the proving ground will be the central city and the main laboratory will be the public school.

In The Public Schools of Chicago, Robert J. Havighurst defines specifically in terms of one city the choice that all big American cities face:

> Chicago is choosing between two alternative futures.
>
> Alternative A is the one Chicago will get if things go on as they have been since 1950. The proportion of manual workers to white-collar workers will increase. Nonwhite population will be about 33 per cent of the total in 1970, instead of 23 per cent as it was in 1960. Racial segregation will continue, with 300,000 more Negroes living in all-Negro areas in 1970 than were doing so in 1960.
>
> Alternative B is what Chicago can achieve if people work for it. White-collar workers will stay in the city or move in from the suburbs. A majority of the population will be white-collar workers. The educational level of adults will rise. The proportions of whites and Negroes might be stabilized around 30 per cent Negro. There will be a slow but steady movement toward residential integration, and the area of Negro residential segregation will not grow larger and will eventually begin to decrease.
>
> To some observers the decline of the central city appears to be inevitable. They see the life of the city dictated by blind economic forces. But other students of the life of cities believe that the people who live in the city can control the direction and nature of its growth.

Dr. Havighurst analyzes how citizens can use or not use the public schools as an instrument to implement their choice between alternative futures, but his analysis could easily be made applicable to other private and public institutions and agencies.

> The public schools are an important and indeed an essential agent in working out the fate of the city, since they largely determine whether people of middle and high income choose to live in the city.
>
> The public schools may be active or passive. . . . They will be passive if the "four walls" school philosophy prevails. In this case the schools will do as good a job as possible for all kinds of students within the school and will stay out of any direct involvement with community renewal programs. If they are passive, and follow the "four walls" principles, the effort at community renewal will probably fail.
>
> If the public schools are active, they will adopt the 'urban community' school philosophy. They will cooperate actively with the effort being made to achieve social and urban renewal in Chicago by the public and private social agencies. They will develop programs and standards of instruction and attendance rules aimed at keeping middle-income people, white and Negro, in the city and encouraging them to live in integrated local communities.[1]

---

[1] The Public Schools of Chicago, A Survey for the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, 1964. The quotations, somewhat rearranged, are from pages 369-70.

The choice Dr. Havighurst defines can be given more general statement. Four walls do not a community make, whether they be the walls of a classroom, a living room, a church, an office, a union hall, or a government agency. American adults face the choice: either to continue to run away individually from their problems, or to decide to make a stand together; either to remain victims of blind forces, or to decide to become agents in directing them; either to hope passively that their children, through schooling, will somehow make a better world when they grow up amid deteriorating conditions, or to rely on themselves today to create new conditions favorable to the kinds of persons, families, neighborhoods, schools, and communities they want to produce and to learn how to do so by undertaking to do so.

Once—not long ago—society could leave to their own self-maintaining and self-renewing processes the air, the waters, living space, the conditions for and mores of stable families and coherent neighborhoods. It can do so no longer. To leave alone is to accept continuing deterioration. American adults must see and deal with their nation as a whole. They must try to grasp and control the entire process of interactions: from the farms and small towns to the small and larger cities, to the metropolises and megalopolises. But the crucial battle is in the central city. Here the stand must be made and won—here, where the people whom nobody values congest and fester in places that have no value except in the currency of misery.

In the central city the citizen must take and win his stand, not as citizen in the political role only, but as parent and neighbor, as businessman and worker, as a member of professional, civic, and voluntary organizations. Co-operatively citizens must use and adapt, discard and invent agencies as needed. They must learn what to do and how to do it. The task itself will be their school. In the "school of public spirit" a person becomes a citizen by doing the work of a citizen and so learns to act like one.

At stake is the deepest value: the infinite worth of each human being. For a while it seemed as though science-technology would give us the bounty with which to hire somebody else to be our brother's keeper. "The significance of the technological revolution is that it makes the exploitation of nature so profitable that the exploitation of man becomes obsolete."[2] The day of self-congratulation for not making an unprofitable slave a slave or not keeping an unprofitable colony a colony has been brief. To let a person alone because you do not need to treat him as a thing is not to treat him as a human being—an end in himself. The most refined form of cruelty is to permit a person or a group to be denied function—to be unneeded, unwanted, without use or value.

Such is the lot of an increasing number of human beings—in the undeveloped nations and in our own highly developed nation. Being human, they will not, of course, endure this state. They will use their one comparative advantage that remains, that, indeed, increases: their superior advantage to cause trouble for the powerful and comfortable because they have little or nothing to lose.

The beginnings of this trouble we can already see—in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, New York City, Chicago, and Los Angeles. Not in the city, nor in the nation, nor in the world is the citizen free to deny that he shares a common nature and a common destiny with his fellow human beings. He is free only to choose between ways of acknowledgment: whether in mutual fear and destructiveness or in mutual hope and co-operation. The price of our indivisible humanness will be exacted, one way or another, and there will be a return, of one kind or another, from what we pay.

THE ADULT AS A WORKER

In the people who have no economic function, many other Americans see their own fear reflected. The first time man ate of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, he was punished by having to work for a living. Now that he has eaten of the fruit of the tree of science-technology, man is punished by the fear he will not be able to work for his living.

What are the prospects for the role of work in the life of the American adult? Or perhaps the question is, what are the prospects for the American adult in the role of work? In the discussions of these questions that are taking place, there is no answer that rings with assurance and is echoed by reassurance. As representatives of two major statements that diverge widely, we can use the memorandum "The Triple Revolution"[1] and the series of articles by Charles E. Silberman, "Technology and the Labor Market," which appeared in Fortune magazine during 1965.

---

[2] Boulding, op. cit., 113.

"The Triple Revolution" advocates a change in national policy:

> The present system encourages activities which can lead to private profit and neglects those activities which can enhance the wealth and the quality of life of our society. Consequently, national policy has hitherto been aimed far more at the welfare of the productive process than at the welfare of people. The era of cybernation can reverse this emphasis. With public policy and research concentrated on people rather than processes, we believe that many creative activities and interests commonly thought of as non-economic will absorb the time and the commitment of many of those no longer needed to produce goods and services. As a first step to a new consensus it is essential to recognize that the traditional link between jobs and incomes is being broken. The economy of abundance can sustain all citizens in comfort and economic security whether or not they engage in what is commonly regarded as work. Wealth produced by machines rather than by men is still wealth. We urge, therefore, that society, through its appropriate legal and governmental institutions, undertake an unqualified commitment to provide every individual and every family with an adequate income as a matter of right.

The memorandum assumes (1) that abundance is a reality, that an increasing number of people will not be needed to produce goods and services; and (2) that an increasing number of people, beginning with those who are now unemployed, do not have the psychological need to know that they earn their livelihood, not as a general right, but as a matter of personal worth. If either or both of these assumptions are false, then an approach would be indicated to restore and strengthen, not to weaken or even cut, the income-job link.

On the other hand, the Fortune series does not show that conventional methods are likely to eliminate the development of a permanently depressed class—almost one-fifth of the nation—in the United States. It contents itself with establishing that the "effect of automation on employment in the U.S. has been wildly and irresponsibly exaggerated." The first, and basic, article in the series concludes:

---

[1] Advertising Age Magazine, April 6, 1964.

> For the last hundred and fifty years of constant technological change, with only rare exceptions, such as in the 1930's, capital and labor have managed to combine in the U.S. so as to keep 95 per cent or more of the labor force employed. This has been a remarkable record, one that has made the U.S. economy the envy of the world. It would be premature to conclude that this record cannot continue indefinitely.[2]

To treat all the depressions in American history in nine words, and the Great Depression in five—with no mention of the factors that brought the U.S. economy out of the Great Depression and that so far have managed to avoid another—this indeed is a marvel of compressed writing. The present record of employment and unemployment, might, as Fortune suggests, continue indefinitely. But no projection can be accepted as good enough that accepts the permanent division of our people into two nations. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has stated the problem: "In our economy . . . those with wanted skills enjoy opportunity and earning power. But the others face a new and stark problem—exclusion on a permanent basis, both as producers and consumers, from economic life. This division of people threatens to create a human slag heap. We cannot tolerate the development of a separate nation of the poor, the unskilled, the jobless, living within another nation of the well-off, the trained and the employed."

* * *

This paper assumes that the role of work in the American society and the adult's role as a worker will become more, not less, important in the future. The adult's role as a worker becomes less dominatingly important as other roles—such as parent and citizen—assert their demands; indeed, the adult's roles as citizen, parent, and worker become increasingly interrelated. But the adult's role as a worker upon whom the family and the nation depend for the material basis of life becomes more important absolutely because abundance is a myth and the need to earn one's "keep" is a basic psychological need in American culture.

Abundance is a myth. Significantly, while the memorandum "The Triple Revolution" repeatedly uses the word "need," it does not once use the word "want."[3] One can say what he thinks another person needs but only that person can say what he wants. Human wants are illimitable. "God has set the world in man's heart," said the Preacher. Human enjoyments are transitory. In the mouth the sugar of pleasure quickly turns to the gall of envy.

---

[2] Fortune, January 1965, 228.

Abundance is a myth. The main reason automation has not resulted, and may not result, in mass unemployment seems to be that the long-range shift in employment from goods to services is continuing.[4] The number of workers needed to produce goods and perform routine services may approach zero—which is a limit. But there is no limit to the number of services human beings are capable of consuming, nor are there limits to the number of people and the amount of time needed to provide the services that only human beings can provide.

Abundance is a myth. In discussions about whether the American people have the resources to achieve by 1975 the national goals that had been set forth through 1961 (not even considering the cost of achieving the goals that President Johnson has since set forth and might set forth), the debate already turns on scarcity, not abundance.[5] The scarcity exists,

---

3. The importance of the distinction will be considered in the next section of this paper, "The Adult in His Pursuit of Happiness."

4. Persons employed changed from about 60 per cent in goods and 40 per cent in services in 1929 to about 45 and 55 respectively today, with the crossing point about 1955—just when automation was becoming common in the United States. (See chart based on the U. S. Office of Business Economics, The New York Times, June 28, 1965.) See also the report it accompanies, "Job Figures Reflect Shift to an Economy Based on Services," by Will Lissner:

> The shift in the nation's employment from goods manufactured into services has become so pronounced that it is no longer correct to call the United States economy an industrial economy. It is a service economy.
>
> Research at the National Bureau of Economic Research, a private nonprofit agency in New York controlled by leading universities and professional organizations, has established the preponderance of the service industries, the bureau reported yesterday.
>
> This preponderance is expected to become even more significant as automation and other technological advances are adopted more widely throughout the economy.

5. See "A New Kind of Balance Sheet Is Needed," The New Republic, June 12, 1965, in which Leon H. Keyserling takes issue with "The Dollar Cost of Our National Goals," by Leonard A. Lecht, director of the National Goals Project of the National Planning Association.

moreover, in what Seymour Mellman calls "Our Depleted Society." "A process of technical, industrial, and human deterioration has been set in motion within American society. The competence of the industrial system is being eroded at its base. Entire industries are falling into technical disrepair, and there is massive loss of productive employment because of inability to hold even domestic markets against foreign competition. Such depletion in economic life produces wide-ranging human deterioration at home. The wealthiest nation on earth has been unable to rally the resources necessary to raise one fifth of its own people from poverty. The same basic depletion operates as an unseen hand restricting America's relations with the rest of the world, limiting foreign-policy moves primarily to military-based initiatives."[6]

The needs and wants of the American people and of other peoples of the world that we cannot ignore, or can ignore only at our peril, are so great and are increasing so fast that all the abilities and energies of all our people will not be enough. If we do not use our human resources fully, it will be because we do not *want* or have not *learned how* to use them; it will not be because the people are not needed.

Just as we need all our people to work, so do our people *need to be needed* to work. For Americans a sense of "being worthy of the hire" is an essential value in the self-assessment of worth. Earning one's "salt" is felt to be the price of the freedom to choose. Dignity based on self-reliance is a concept of high importance and immeasurable value. Science-technology requires that we supplement our sense of independence with a sense of interdependence, but we should seek the supplement through expanding the sense of responsibility to help others become self-reliant, not through restricting the sense of responsibility for one's self. The feeling that a person is neither exploited by nor dependent on others, that a person can depend upon himself for his livelihood, is important to everyone and *most important to those who are trying to emerge from exploitation or dependency*. No talk of fostering new values is realistic that leaves out of account pride in self-reliance. No program of admitting the American Negro to the American community on equal terms has meaning that does not include the effort to give him the self-respect that comes from fulfilling an economic function.

---

[6] *Our Depleted Society* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), 3.

The adult's role as a worker becomes more important absolutely because more depends—literally—upon him. The nation's population between the ages of eighteen and sixty-five—the usually productive base—is declining relative to the increasing percentages under eighteen and over sixty-five—the usually dependent wings. In 1950, 58.7 per cent of the population was between 18 and 65, while 41.3 per cent was under 18 and over 65; in 1960, 52.8 per cent was between 18 and 65, while 47.2 per cent was under 18 and over 65: a proportionate loss of 19 per cent in a single decade. In the 1960's all the trends continue—longer schooling for more and more young people, earlier retirement and longer life for more and more old people. The base grows narrower; the wings grow wider; and onto the narrowing base are piled more and more burdens to support—higher standards of living, increasing costs of education and welfare, expanding and more costly programs of research and development and foreign and international commitments.

* * *

The more important the adult's role as a worker grows, the more important does learning become in that role. Let us note a few of the ways in which this is so.

(1) The upgrading of the nation's educational level—not automation and other technological changes—is the main reason why 10 to 20 per cent of our young people, especially young Negroes, are losing ground in status and opportunities.[7]

---

[7] Peter Drucker gives three reasons why the increasing supply of better educated people is undermining the status of the manual worker in America. (1) "While most appointments to foremanships before World War II went to men on the factory floor, today, increasingly, a young fellow with some college education is brought in directly as assistant foreman and gets the next vacant foremanship. (2) The educational upgrading of the American population tends to downgrade also the social status of the manual worker and to make him appear progressively less important. (3) The greatest impact of the educational changes on the manual worker's status is, however, still ahead: It threatens to uproot the oldest and most proudly held tradition, that of the skilled craftsman. Now, two new and very different axioms are replacing . . . traditional ones. The first is: All craft skills are at bottom very much alike. . . . As a result, skilled jobs increasingly combine skill-elements from several crafts that traditionally have been separated. . . . The second new rule is even more revolutionary: Craft skills need not be acquired through long experience. They can be taught and learned systematically and in a very short time." "Automation Is Not the Villain," The New York Times Magazine, January 10, 1965.

(2) The shift in the nation's employment from goods manufactured into services makes it necessary for workers continually to keep up with new developments in equipment, skills, tastes, fashions, ideas, trends, and the like.

(3) Technological change is making continuing learning a condition of durable employment. Secretary Wirtz has pointed out: "What once might have been a job for life is now only one of five or six a man might hold during the working life shorter than that of his father's. . . . The only clear job security today is in continuous education, even of an informal sort. So we have come to expect not only changes in the content of knowledge but changes, almost as rapid, in the content of employment."

The list of ways in which learning becomes more important to the adult as a worker could be indefinitely extended. Essentially, because technological change is the product of a rationalized industry of discovery and development, in response, systematic programs of continuing learning are becoming necessary complements to the policies and practices of the professions, industry, business, labor unions, service activities, and governments. Continuing learning is coming to be recognized as a natural function essential to the conduct of economic affairs, private and corporate; and the most important developments in the processes of learning for the future can be looked for initially in the field of continuing learning by and for adults and only derivatively in the field of formal schooling for children and young people.

* * *

This paper predicts that the increasing demands upon their resources will compel the American people to realize that they are dealing, not with abundance, but with scarcities everywhere, and the greatest scarcity will be people who have the talents and skills to do all that is needed. It predicts, further, that to relieve the scarcity of able, well-prepared persons, the American people will rationalize and systematize continuing learning. A few of the many large changes that will be made have been suggested.

(1) Instead of the present policies of making entrance into work later and later and retirement from work earlier and earlier, policies will be adopted in which learning experiences and work experiences will be co-

terminous throughout adult life, beginning earlier in youth and extending later into old age.

(2) Vocational schools will be developed that prepare young workers for careers in which the content of both the knowledge and the jobs will be expected to change.

(3) Businesses and industries will search their rank-and-file employees for talented and ambitious young people who have not had formal education and will encourage and help them to develop their capacities through specially tailored educational programs.

(4) Unions will make it possible for members to move from one craft skill to others without losing seniority.

(5) Within large fields—such as industries, technologies, and governments, there will be *systems and processes* of continuing training-education designed to prepare, move up, and use people in more demanding roles—upgrading the unskilled to the semi-skilled, the semi-skilled to the skilled, the skilled to the highly skilled, the highly skilled to the professional and the professional to the post-professional.

But at the bottom of the pyramid there yawns a gulf. Below that gulf is what Secretary Wirtz called the "human slag heap." It isn't *developing*; it has developed. They are there—by the hundreds of thousands in every central city: the adults who lack not only the skills of work but also even the basic human skills for the urban culture into whose dump they have been cast. We cannot leave them there merely to exist until they die, because they are human beings and we have become aware of them. They are, moreover, procreating human beings, the most prolific of all; the genetical springs of a constant stream of new lives will be doomed, at best, to degradation and, at worst, to the destruction of themselves and others. These are the ones whose babies we must take or whom we must help become responsible parents. These adults, who know the least, we know the least how to teach. We must learn how. Such disciplines as cultural anthropology, sociology, psychology, psychiatry, and education have concepts, insights, and analytic tools that could be translated into programs of action, from which we would learn more.

An example of this approach is a theory of illiteracy stated by social scientists at the University of Chicago. It views the problem of adult illiterates or semi-illiterates in terms of *acculturization*—the learning of new, and the unlearning of old, patterns of social interaction, communication, and cultural meaning required for life in a metropolis. It assumes that adult illiterates or semi-illiterates bring to the classroom a culture of their own, with its own rules and modes of social experience that are vastly different from the culture of the classroom and the teacher. It requires those who design and execute an adult literacy program—the planners, administrators, recruiters, preparers or selectors of materials and the teachers—to acquaint themselves with the culture of their adult pupils and to respect them and treat them as adults in order that the program may promote social literacy as well as teach the skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic.[8]

THE ADULT IN HIS PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

In the previous three chapters, we have considered the adult person in several of the roles he plays in several systems; that is to say, in interaction between himself and his environment, physical and social. Coming now to consider the person in his pursuit of happiness, we attend to the other of his two continuing problems—the regulation of the inner forces that make him a whole. In the pursuit of happiness, the person is not playing a role, or, if so, he is playing himself. He may pursue the objects of happiness in his environment, but happiness itself, or its lack, is an inward experience.

Anything of public meaning that can be said of so private an experience as happiness must be stated in terms of man's common human nature. This common human experience recognizes a basic distinction between pleasure, or pleasantness—a consciousness of the moment—and happiness—a consciousness that, even during the moment, includes the past and the future as well. This distinction has been stated in various oppositions: Aristotle's passions versus reason, Kant's desire versus duty, and Freud's pleasure-principle versus reality-principle. The reality-principle, Freud said, "demands and enforces the postponement of satisfaction, the renunciation of manifold possibilities and the temporary endurance of pain."

---

[8] See Robert D. Hess and June Tapp, "The Problem of Literacy," Appendix A of Educational Rehabilitation, An Evaluation of the Adult Basic Education Program of the State of Illinois (New York and Chicago: Greenleigh Associates, 1965).

The basic distinction between pleasure and happiness indicates that the pursuit of happiness is closely related to—perhaps is even the same as—the quest for self-definition and self-realization. However they may differ in method and content, Socrates' way to the harmony of the soul through self-knowledge and the psychiatrist's way to the integrity of the personality through self-understanding are directed toward the same end.

The pursuit of happiness, or the quest for self-understanding and self-realization, has always been recognized as a lifelong process of learning. It is made more complicated, and the function of learning in the quest is made proportionately more important, by the consequences of science-technology, both upon the inner forces of the personality and upon the environment.

The Inner Forces

A person today must try to understand himself as a blending of biological, mental, and social events. Biologically, man must learn to think of himself in perspectives dwarfing even those that Darwin opened a little more than a century ago when he suggested that man descended from ape-like ancestors. Modern biologists suggest that man descended from the chance organization of a few giant molecules.

Biochemists suggest the possibilities of controlling the matrical molecules that control genetical transmission and biological development. Chemists and geneticists suggest that it may be possible, since all living cells seem more alike than different, to regulate the metabolism of cells and thereby modify the behavior of man. Pharmacologists indicate that man's moods are determined in part by the chemicals fed his cells. Mathematician-physicists suggest the possibility of describing the nervous system in mathematical terms and thereby converting electronic stimuli into sensations or ideas.

Together, these and other possibilities suggest that man is approaching the capability of creating a new human species. The individual person must try to comprehend the implications of these opening vistas, both to understand himself and others and to participate responsibly in the awesome decisions that loom. In the spectrum of life, biochemistry may place man ever closer to the amoeba, but science-technology is placing him ever closer to God.

* * *

When man uses introspection—the oldest technique—to understand himself, he finds that even in the most secret places the consequences of science-technology make the task more difficult and the role of learning more important. Using James's discrimination between two aspects of self-awareness, the knowing I becomes more mysterious and the known me's become more numerous and disorganized.

This I—this event of self-awareness in the perpetual present—must somehow, through memory and foresight and immediate control, achieve enough coherence in the flux of perceptions to survive and develop. To this difficult task psychiatry contributes the burdens and the advantages of concepts of other levels of experience—both undertones and overtones—that must be brought into some degree of awareness and under some degree of control. The I must learn to train the id as he would a cunning beast and to manipulate the superego as he would a not-so-cunning tyrant.

When a person turns the light of self-consciousness upon his me's, he finds them to be a mob, which he must order, himself playing several roles in several plays. He must learn to behave differently in different contexts. His sense of identity must achieve enough coherence to enable him to survive and develop. Psychological maturity is the ability to participate effectively in increasingly complicated and diverse human interactions. The consequences of science-technology multiply the roles, alter the lines, occasionally even change the plots and, perhaps most troubling, separate the contexts of the roles and de-personalize their contents. Increasingly the person regards himself and others, and they regard him, as performers representing institutions. The "image" is the modern masque. As Woodrow Wilson put it: "Yesterday, and ever since history began, men were related to one another as individuals. . . . Today the every-day relationships of men are largely with great impersonal concerns, with organizations, not with other individual men. Now this is nothing short of a new social age, a new era of human relationships, a new stage-setting for the drama of life."[1]

---

[1] The New Freedom (Garden City and New York: Doubleday, 1913), 6-7.

Imperceptibly we have passed through the porous wall that separates the self as mental events into the self as social events. Man is a reflexive verb: the subject and the object are the same. To a degree he does what he does because of what he is and to a degree he becomes what he does.

To understand himself, man must try also to understand the culture that shapes him even before he is born; that gives social meaning to his body, gender, talents, genealogy, race, religion, occupation, and nationality. The culture provides the criteria for self-evaluation and the evaluation of others.

The consequences of science-technology complicate the personal task of orientation by involving him in a large number of sub-systems, systems, and larger systems whose ways and demands differ and may even conflict. These systems and their relationships are in quickening change. A part of acquiring personal wisdom is to see ourselves as others see us and to see others as they see themselves. In the modern world of interdependency, a part of acquiring social wisdom is to see the culture of our own group as members of other groups see it and to see other cultures as the members of those groups see them. With this wisdom comes the anguishing discovery that the larger the collectives are, the less moral they become and that their immoralities derive their sanction and their savagery from the self-righteousness of the individuals who compose them. Woe to the naked individual conscience opposing the collectivity armored with loyalties and powered by mass will!

* * *

It is perhaps the striving for identity that has made the age of science-technology the age of nationalism. And science-technology's exploration of the physical universe—outward to the galaxies, inward to the nuclei of cells and atoms—is perhaps as much as anything else man's search for a home in the universe. Did not the information that Mariner IV radioed back from Mars leave mankind with a sense of loneliness?

The quest for self-identity and self-understanding, whether or not it is the same as the pursuit of happiness, provides no assurance that happiness will be attained, if happiness means emotional salvation or peace of mind. Lost ignorance, like lost innocence, cannot be regained. To be informed today is to be troubled by matters that in earlier days disturbed only the sleep of kings. One can studiously avoid being informed, but the knowledge of why one is trying not to know cannot be unlearned. It cankers the rose in Candide's garden.

Perhaps the highest human good is the quest to understand and to live according to the best understanding. Perhaps happiness, and self-definition, too, are serendipities.[2] Certainly, those who seem to be most unhappy and least sure of who they are, are those whose selves are Iron Maidens, in contrast to those who "forget themselves" by participating in a common field of open relationships.

> In the sense of personality, we are what we *do* unto others and what they *do* unto us. The consolation of having *our* transgressions forgiven on the grounds of ignorantly not knowing what we are doing has served man poorly. There is, perhaps, more hope in knowledge than in forgivingness, for the evidence exists that man, occasionally and episodically, can learn to achieve—not as an ethical code but as a matter of grim necessity—the skill to reach that mutuality which recognizes that the basic question is not *Who am I?* but *What are we doing to each other?*
>
> In evaluating his own behavior, man must learn to focus upon the consequences of his acts rather than upon his heartfelt intentions, recognizing that the good that he would do often begets evil. . . . It is the *consequences of our intentions* that enhance or destroy us.[3]

Thus the role of learning in the quest for self-understanding is intensified by science-technology's impact upon the inner forces of the personality. Similarly, learning is made more important in the quest for self-fulfillment in the surrounding world.

The Environment

Because the possibilities of human life far exceed what one can make actual in one lifetime, life's major task becomes the organizing of its own own wants and needs.[4] In order to govern his behavior so as to fulfill himself, a person must identify the continuing needs behind his wants and criticize his wants according to their appropriateness. Obvious and insistent, wants power our behavior and seem to indicate the objectives to be sought. But wants are misleading criteria for well-being because our objectives do not necessarily satisfy our wants, and our wants do not necessarily satisfy our needs. Needs are usually neither obvious nor immediately insistent; we have to infer them from our wants.[5] Needs can always be stated in terms of establishing and maintaining or breaking down and avoiding relationships between the self and some aspect of the environment—physical, social, or spiritual. Wants and their satisfactions are episodes; needs and their meetings are processes.

---

[2] "Like many of the finest things of life, like happiness and tranquillity and fame, the gain that was most precious was not the thing sought, but one that came of itself in the search for something else."—Benjamin N. Cardozo, quoted in Theodore G. Remer, *Serendipity and the Three Princes* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1965), 11.

[3] Meyer Maskin, "The Science of Personality," *An Outline of Man's Knowledge of the Modern World*, ed. Lyman Bryson (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), 114.

[4] The development of this idea would require further distinctions, such as those between attractions and repulsions, wants and non-wants, seekings and shunnings, well-being and ill-being, the need to establish

Because it vastly multiplies the possibilities of life, science-technology makes the organizing of wants and needs—life's major task—correspondingly more difficult. On the one hand, it multiplies wants and the objects of want, and on the other hand, it obscures needs within an environment that is complex, impersonal, and artificial (defined in terms of the stimuli which man's instinctual dispositions have evolved to respond to).

There is still more. It is very difficult to identify needs and criticize wants in American society because the creation of wants is an acknowledged function of the economic system and is the occupation of a whole profession. This profession wields all the technologies of mass communication and is guided by all the insights of individual and social psychology to make any audience want to do whatever those who pay the cost-deductible bill want them to want to do.

For a person to have any chance of attaining happiness or of defining and fulfilling himself, he must consciously and continually make the quest his own. He must be peculiar, in the root sense of belonging to himself. In thus declaring his independence he will also be serving a healthful interdependence, for "in proportion to the development of his individuality, each person becomes more valuable to himself, and is therefore capable of being more valuable to others. There is a greater fullness of

---

and maintain some relationships and the need to break off and avoid other relationships.

[5] Even the apparently obvious physiological needs, such as for food, drink, and rest are not simple in their relations to cravings to eat, drink, and sleep.

life about his own existence, and when there is more life in the units there is more life in the mass which is composed of them."[6]

Earlier, this paper found the social prescriptions of the memorandum "The Triple Revolution" defective because its authors failed to distinguish between wants and needs. If they had not presumed to ignore entirely people's wants, which are illimitable, they could not have presumed abundance. If they had not assumed that people do not have a psychological need to feel worthy of the hire, they could not have presumed that cutting the income-through-jobs link would meet people's needs. Having so criticized others' presumptions, it would be inconsistent now to prescribe what people need and should and should not want. But certain basic human needs can be identified, and it can be observed that the consequences of science-technology unsettle all the relationships involved in these needs: the religious relationship between a person and whatever he may consider the divine; the ecological relationship between man and nature; the sexual relationship between man and woman; the familial relationships in the procession of the generations; the social relationships between the individual and the society; the time-space relationships between the here-now and the then-there. All these and other threads in the fabric of being have been unraveled from inherited patterns. Each person must choose between letting them fray and tangle as they will and trying to weave them again into a coherence that is meaningful to him.

The greatest degree of freedom a person can assert—indeed, at times it may seem the only freedom he has—is to assume command over his aspirations for himself, especially his concepts of status and success. A person needs to feel that he occupies some position that is appropriate to himself in his own right—not just as a function. He needs to feel that he is doing things worth doing in their own right—not just something that others will pay to have done. A person has most scope for self-fulfillment when he cultivates activities and enjoyments that are personally meaningful and satisfying as ends in themselves.

These private dimensions for status and success are all about us, to be discovered, explored and created: the family, the neighborhood, the community, voluntary organizations, the amenities of human relationships, nature, science, the arts, even the self as a work of art. Activities to this end are not "killtime" or "makework" or pacifiers or placebos but avenues to self-respect, joy, and personal significance, avenues on which all may travel, each on his own terms, toward his own destination, at his own speed, and to the sound of his own music.

---

[6] J. S. Mill, "On Liberty," The English Philosophers from Bacon to Mill, ed. Edwin A. Burtt (New York: Random House, 1939), 998.

So engaged, a person knows the meaning of R. M. MacIver's distinction between time as measured and time as lived: "There is time as that which dates all happenings, and there is time as that within which potency realizes itself, vitality fulfills itself, experience grows and expresses itself. . . . We live part of our time, and we live through the rest. The proportion depends on many things but mostly on what we are and what we have become. We live our life when we exchange it for worthwhile experience, for experience that absorbs and satisfies. There is no one criterion for experience that is worthwhile. We are variantly constituted, and what absorbs the heart and mind of one may fail to move another. Perhaps the only partial test is that the experience must appear good in retrospect when it has worked itself out in its fruits. There are high moments of experience, whatever our lot otherwise may have been, whatever the range of our potentialities, when the life spirit takes full possession of us. It is as though all unknowingly we had reached a mountain top and seen below us the wonder of the earth, as it never appears to our ordinary sight. And when we have descended, we may say in effect: It was good for us to have been there. And the memory bequeaths something to many quieter hours, conveying the sense that our time is no longer being lived through but being lived."[7]

This Wordsworthian expression of the experience of hours or days filled with engrossing purpose, after which there remains the enduring sense of time redeemed, makes us aware of how little society can do for a person in his *time as lived*. One can pay another for his *time as measured*. One can speculate, with widely divergent results, on how much *time as measured* will be displaced by technology.[8] Society could arrange, as the Ad Hoc Committee on the Triple Revolution recommends, to support people regardless of jobs, in the hope that "many creative activities and interests commonly thought of as non-economic will absorb (their) time and commitment."[9] Society could even organize, as some "professional leisurists" advocate, programs to lead (or drive?) people to practice the "fine art of living."[10] But most conferences on leisure are the worked-to-death worrying themselves to death about the bored-to-death. In our persons and in all our roles we should be concerned about the effects upon others of what we are and do, about the conditions and environments within which they live, about the exposures and opportunities that are available to them. But we must recognize the sharp limits to what we can do and the peril of violating the peculiarity of the human personality. Only a person himself can learn to live in time, and his fulfilling moments are the seed-bearing fruits of life-long self-creation.[11]

---

[7] *The Challenge of the Passing Years, My Encounter with Time* (New York: Pocket Books, Inc.), 122-30.

[8] Sebastian de Grazia, author of the Twentieth Century Fund's study, *Of Time, Work, and Leisure* (1962), argues (pp. 86-90) that Americans actually have less true leisure now than did many persons in the era of dawn-to-dusk labor. "If added up, all the elements that did not exist in the pattern of 1850 but do exist today (. . . migration, the journey to work . . . women working)—all factors that take time away from time off the job and

---

yet are related to the job—the difference between 1850 and 1960 comes down to a few hours."

[9] Today those persons who seem to have the greatest capacity to use leisure creatively have least free time and those who have most empty time seem to have the least capacity to use leisure creatively. This fact indicates that a simple cutting of the job-income link could not be expected to alter the quality of the use of time.

[10] At a conference on leisure held at Philadelphia in 1963 under the auspices of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, James C. Charlesworth, President of the Academy and professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, said: "Earnest leisurists should exert pressure on every American state legislature to establish a department of leisure and to empower it to formulate and enforce standards for local communities. State and local leisure agencies would have equal status with public education agencies. The federal government would be expected to 'subsidize the weaker states.' ("Leisure in America: Blessing or Curse?" The Annals, 1964, 36-38, 45, 58.)

[11] Winston S. Churchill, who was helped to keep his sanity during two crises of "utterly unwonted leisure" by developing painting as a pastime, has left us advice that the cultivation of a hobby and new forms of interest is "a policy of first importance to a public man. But this is not a business that can be undertaken in a day or swiftly improvised by a mere command of the will. The growth of alternative mental interests is a long process. . . . To be really happy and really safe, one ought to have at least two or three hobbies, and they must all be real. It is no use starting late in life to say, 'I will take an interest in this or that.' Such an attempt only aggravates the strain of mental effort. A man may acquire great knowledge of topics unconnected with his daily work, and yet hardly get any benefit or relief. It is no use doing what you like; you have got to like what you do. . . . It may also be said that rational, industrious, useful human beings are divided into two classes: first, those whose work is work and whose pleasure is pleasure; and, secondly, those whose work and pleasure are one. . . . Yet to both classes the need of an alternative

CONCLUSIONS

By multiplying the occasions and alternatives and magnifying the issues of choice, science-technology makes life not easier but harder for man in his human capacity. His fateful choice at this moment in history is whether to pay what it will cost to construct deliberately the conditions that will enable him to achieve and maintain the relationships he needs and to avoid the limits he must not transgress, or to pay the compounding costs of not doing so. The choice is between trying to achieve self-control and accepting the control of senseless forces; between trying to open the spirals of self and selves—of human systems—and permitting them to continue to close in upon him.

So stated, man's choice should be simple. But the rub is, who is man? Man as mankind has no organization equal in scope to the collective decisions he needs to make, he has no common culture out of which to fashion a common organization, and he has no system of common personal values that is the core of a culture. All man as mankind has is a common nature, a common destiny, and a cluster of agencies through which some, but not all, of the nations work together some, but not all, of the time.

The national state—the highest form of effective political organization that man has evolved—has become an obstacle to the evolution of world government. Justifying itself, when it does, in terms of its service to its own people and, sometimes, to the world, it is jealous of competing loyalties to individual or world-wide values. So, while a world government seems a requisite for man's survival, a world government could be achieved in any foreseeable future only by conquest; and any nation could seek conquest only by precipitating a war that would make survival improbable and, even if successful, could maintain conquest only by by means that would violate the values for which survival is worthwhile.

In spite of these paradoxes, the fact remains: in our generation the highest form of social and political organization that man has evolved for making and executing his collective decisions is the national state.

---

outlook, of a change of atmosphere, of a diversion of effort, is essential. Indeed, it may well be that those whose work is their pleasure are those who most need the means of banishing it at intervals from their minds." —*Painting as a Pastime* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), 8-10.

In the last analysis, this is the best he has because he has nothing better. In their federal democracy, the American people have a national society whose basic value is the infinite worth of each individual person. This value has given coherence to our nation. It is the only value both spacious and flexible enough to be shared by all peoples, not as an American import, but as the human core for a common world society. Because it was founded upon this ideal, from its beginning the American nation has always been of special consequence to the entire human race. Not even in Jefferson's or Lincoln's times did the United States of America have more consequence to all the peoples of the world than it has today. In its ideal of individual worth, rather than in its power, the American society has significance for all humanity, because our relative power is bound to decline as other regions of the world are developed, but our ideal is infinite and will become more meaningful as more peoples try to learn to govern themselves.

So, to the question, who is man? The operative answer for each American citizen is that he is man—not because America is the equivalent of mankind, but because history has cast America in the role of the agent for mankind. Self-government, democracy, is more than the blind result of the forces of selfish interests, more than the counting of heads; it is a practice of mutual accommodation so inveterate that its members make their own coherence the overriding consideration. Because each American is acting in behalf of all mankind, including those who do not govern themselves, each American's sense of self should be open. Interdependency requires of us that we think, feel, and act in terms of larger wholes and more embracing relationships, and these wholes and relationships must comprehend the planet and the human race.

Having thus distilled "man" into the personalities, culture, and organizations over which we can feel some control, we can restate the alternative to passive acceptance of the constricting and disintegrating consequences of science-technology. The alternative is to strive to achieve a new order of dynamic balance.

The concept of balance is evolving. The physician Walter B. Cannon coined the word "homeostasis" ("similar" plus "stand") to designate the regulatory process by which an organism maintains steady states amid continual change.[1] Extending the idea, the biologist C. H. Waddington coined the word "homeorhesis" ("similar" plus "flow") to designate the regulatory process by which an organism returns to a normal path of development after it has been put off course by external influences.[2] Both processes are instances of "course-holding"—the one where the course is constant, the other where it varies with time—and in both the course is pre-determined.

---

[1] The Wisdom of the Body (New York: Norton Co., 1939).

By analogy, we can say that the traditional society was a homeostatic society. The culturization of its on-coming generations was for the purpose of enabling them to maintain steady states within tolerable limits.

By analogy also, we can say that present day society—for our concern, the American—is a homeorhesic society. It recognizes that many changes have occurred and that more will occur, but assumes that the world will remain recognizable enough so that goals can be set early in life and that formal schooling can give children and youth the skills to pursue their goals throughout adult life.

But here biological analogies end. What happens when a creature comes to the end of the line of pre-determined development, or even the end which man can anticipate? There is no word such as "homeokainis" ("similar" plus "invent") to designate a kind of course-setting and course-holding into the unknown. Only human beings and their organizations have had to face this problem, and they are having to recognize it fully during the present generation—during, indeed, the current decade.

What is called for is a new type of person and a new type of society. Looking exultantly down the democratic vistas, Walt Whitman cried: "We must entirely recast the types of highest personality from what the oriental, feudal, ecclesiastical worlds bequeath us . . . now there shall be a man cohered out of tumult and chaos." Looking ironically along the projection of his dynamic theory of history, Henry Adams foresaw "every

---

[2] "If a process of embryonic development is disturbed, it usually returns to normality sometime before reaching the adult condition. Its trajectory, that is to say, converges not merely on the normal end state, but to some earlier point on the path leading to the steady state. . . . Such a system exhibits a tendency toward a certain kind of equilibrium which is restored after disturbances; but this equilibrium is not centered on the static state but rather on a direction or pathway of change. We might speak of such an equilibrium property as a condition of 'homeorhesis' . . . on the analogy with the well-known expression homeostasis, which is appropriate when it is an unchanging state which is maintained." —*The Strategy of the Genes* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1957), 32.

American who lived into the year 2000 would know how to control unlimited power." For the new kind of person and the new kind of society that are required, this paper suggests the name homeodynamic.

"One thing we have learned in this century about the behavior of organisms undergoing exponential growth is that the log phase does not continue indefinitely."[3] The exponential, or log, curve bends over and flattens out into the more general "S-curve" of growth. Both the exponential and the "S-curve" describe phases of growth; both approach infinity; but the first, if uncontrolled, is cancerous and cannot be maintained; the second is healthy and can be maintained indefinitely. Even to have the "S-curves" of knowledge and power continue indefinitely toward infinity, man must achieve and maintain the conditions of stable development. To last a long time, man must choose the S-curve to infinity.

Cannon said that the unstable stuff of organisms "learned" how to keep a steady course through homeostasis, and Waddington said that organisms "learned" how to keep a varying course through homeorhesis. Homeodynamic balance, too, must be learned—consciously and with purpose. "Now we must develop an almost new form of learning. We have to learn from rapidly changing systems. Ordinarily we learn from stable systems. . . . Perhaps the greatest task of applied social science at the moment is to study the conditions under which we learn from rapidly changing systems. If we can discover these conditions, there may still be hope for the human race."[4]

To indicate the new type of learning that our scientific-technological age requires, this paper has distinguished between three types of learning: hereditary-cultural—what a culture transmits to a new human being before he is mature; adaptive-cultural—what a human being learns during maturity; and inventive-cultural—the gist of science-technology. The paper suggested that, to resolve the basic tension between those components of our culture that have become inventive of the future and those that remain imitative of the past: 1) hereditary-cultural learning will have to be oriented to the future; 2) adaptive-cultural learning also will have to become oriented to the future and will have consciously and systematically to become the regulatory function in the lives of mature individuals and in the operations of social organizations; and 3) we must look to changes in the learning of adults to be the origin of these developments, not changes in the learning of the young, although, of course, increasingly the reactions between the generations will become reciprocal.

---

[3] Bentley Glass, "Information Crisis in Biology," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Vol. 18 (October, 1962), 12.

[4] Kenneth Boulding, "After Civilization, What?" Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Vol. 18 (October, 1962), 6.

Learning is the way by which our centaur society can complete its now part-way evolution from the homeostatic, imitative, society to the homeodynamic, inventive, society. This paper has marshalled evidence that the evolution of learning is under way. It found the evidence, not in the highly institutionalized field of formal education for children and young people, but in the largely unformed and often belittled field of continuing self-learning by adults. It found some of the most hopeful developments being advanced by those who are struggling with the deepest and fastest currents of change and who purposefully, systematically continue to learn, not according to educational theories, often not even under the name of education, but pragmatically as the naturally intelligent way to cope with the reality of flux.

As it recognizes that the problem of learning is fundamental to the solution of all social problems, our society will, in one respect, become more like the traditional society than it is now. Formerly, the function of culturizing the young was suffused throughout the society, not assigned to a specialized institution. The homeodynamic society, too, will suffuse the function of learning throughout all its relationships and organizations. There will, however, be a difference: instead of the young learning from the adults, everybody will be learning from everybody and everything throughout life. There may, perhaps, be a second difference: it may be recognized that learning in a world of constant, rapid change is a task, not of culturization, but of acculturization for everyone. In a country continually new, we are all recent immigrants. We are strangers and afraid in the world that we have made. The land is ours before we are the land's. It will be our home when we have become "naturalized"—when we, or our children, or our children's children have become "cohered out of tumult and chaos."

52

SPEAKING FOR MYSELF

A Humanist Approach To Adult Education For A Technical Age

ANDRIES DEINUM
Associate Professor in Humanities
Portland Center for Continuing Education,
Oregon State System of Higher Education

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**
at Boston University

THE LIBRA [illegible]

CONTINUING [illegible]

THE CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS was established in 1951 by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with universities seeking to initiate or improve programs of liberal education for adults. In 1964 CSLEA affiliated with Boston University. The purpose of the Center is to help American higher education institutions develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults.

Copyright 1966 by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Yn Oantinken fan Heit (1886-1966)

4
n. 52

PREFACE

Andries Deinum is Associate Professor of Humanities and Consultant to the Division of Continuing Education of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. For many years he has served as teacher and staff member at the Portland Center. He is best known as an expert on the cinema and conducts the only really sustained program of film education in the country. But that is not the reason we are publishing selections from his papers.

Deinum's writing is important because it reflects an intriguing personality at work in adult education. Deinum is a humane man in a technical age. He is able to be personal in an age of anonymity. He is always himself when he talks or writes. In an age of specialists, he insists on being a well-informed amateur. He has no doubt about the ultimate end of education—it is to produce humanists who are not afraid to speak for themselves.

Yet this "old-fashioned" man uses the most modern instruments for his teaching—the mass media, and especially television. He has achieved an ability to be personal in these media, through the development of the spoken essay, in the best traditions of the informal essays of Addison and Steele or his own favorite, Montaigne. Most of the papers published here were originally presented on television or as lectures before large audiences. They are printed with only minor editorial revisions to retain the flavor of his original adaptation of the essay to this modern purpose.

The collection is divided into three sections. The first section contains "Speaking for Myself," an essay of introduction that states the author's case eloquently and forcefully. Section II includes essays that deal with principles, not as elements of a systematic philosophy, but rather as a collection of ideas crucial to Deinum's thinking. The last section contains essays developed in practice, exemplars of the author's application of his ideas in some of his programs concerned with vital issues of Portland and of our times.

We believe Andries Deinum has something important to say to adult educators. There is both joy and profit from acquaintance with this perceptive and warm colleague who makes us proud of our profession.

James B. Whipple
Boston

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

SPEAKING FOR MYSELF: AN INTRODUCTION. 1

ESSAYS ON PRINCIPLE 8

University Extension and Program Development 9

The University and Educational Television 12

The Teaching and Use of Film as Film 19

Continuing Higher Education: An Essay in Quotations 22

ESSAYS IN PRACTICE 34

The Humanity of Van Gogh. 35

The Image of Love in Film 48

Searching for Portland 58

Goofing and Planning 62

A Lover's Quarrel with Pageantry 76

To Stop Living the Lie 86

SPEAKING FOR MYSELF:[*] AN INTRODUCTION

The name of this program is "Speaking For Myself." Clearly with a title like that, the first thing I am obliged to do is to tell you who I am so you know whom I am speaking for. My name is Andries Deinum. My background is not American. I was born in the Netherlands, but my accent is not really Dutch; it is partly Frisian. Friesland is a part of the Netherlands where we have a language all our own; but that we will talk about later.

I've been in this country for twenty-three years. I was nineteen when I came here. I attended secondary school at a gymnasium in the Netherlands, received my bachelor's degree from Stanford (in journalism of all things!), and got a master's degree from UCLA. I do not have the normal Good Academic Housekeeping Seal of Approval—the doctor's degree. I thought I ought to tell you. In my case, it was simply a choice between getting an education and getting a Ph.D. Someone has to keep amateur his standing.

At any rate, I got most of my education from every public library and every intelligent person I have been near, and I have been very fortunate in that respect. I've made my living mostly in films, in various capacities—as a stooge, assistant director, research director. I was fortunate in that I have been a stooge to some rather good people. For a while I made my living in quite an odd way. I was trained as a spy—not by the Russians but by the Americans as a member of the OSS. I was the best lockpicker in my class, but I never found the skill of any use in trying to pick the locks of the minds of my students. I have been a teacher of film for quite a while, first at the University of Southern California and more recently at the General Extension Division of the Oregon System of Higher Education. I've done film programs at the public library, at the museum, at the Portland extension center.

---

[*] Edited transcript of the introductory program in an educational television series, presented on KOAP-TV and KOAC-TV, September 25, 1961.

My chief interest is in the arts and their relationships, in cultural history. In general, this means art and society; in particular, I am interested in the main elements of contemporary cultural history, the mass media, and especially the most ignored of them all—film. My title at the General Extension Division is consultant in humanities. I am not quite sure what that means, but maybe we will find out together. One thing that it means to me though—and I ought to state this—is a strong bias in favor of the humanities. Most of what I know lies in the area of the humanities. I think that needs to be stated in an age in which practically all support and attention goes to science. Another thing I ought to state—it ought not to be necessary, but nowadays it is. I have even a stronger bias in favor of humanity, all of it. In an age when people speak casually about eliminating a large part of it, it becomes necessary to state that bias.

Some of you know of me; most of you don't. It is not very important. These are going to be quite personal talks and you will get to know me in the course of listening to them. It isn't that I am personally so important, but that we need more people speaking for themselves.

I think the main characteristic of mass society and the mass media is their impersonality. They talk at you, they do not talk with you—like traffic signs. Every man, whether we like it or not, is rapidly becoming an island. We are becoming isolated clusters of humanity with very little communication between the clusters. There is a very genuine fear about the very survival of the person in mass society; you all know about that. Libraries are full of books about alienation, depersonalization, the "lonely crowd," and all that. It is as if some impersonal force were practicing a divide-and-rule policy on all of us.

The very nature of the mass media, of course, is impersonality. They are trying to sell commodities to as many people as possible and, in doing so, they have to please everyone and so can't please anyone personally. Most television programs are very slick, highly identically packaged products. Emphasis is on the package, not on the content. They used to say that certain foods were "untouched by human hands." I think most television programs right now could carry the sign "untouched by human minds."

But you can't blame commercial television. They have to make a profit somehow, and they do it the easiest way they can. They look at you primarily as a consumer and only secondarily as a person. Now it ought to be said, too—and I want to be very straight about that—that all commercial television is not a wasteland. Recently I watched two shattering hours of television on two different channels—the Angola program on NBC and ABC's magnificant program "Walk in My Shoes," on the American Negro. I think a great tribute should be paid to the Bell and Howell Company for its truly enlightened sponsorship of the latter program.

Now educational television hasn't much to crow about yet either. Lack of money means that we can't do what the commercial channels can do. It is often also impersonal by its very nature—in the teaching of credit programs, for example. Much of the criticism of educational television from the inside boils down to the fact that we give too many answers and ask too few questions. Generally, we don't involve our audience. What I am trying to do here is to meet some of those criticisms. I am not a good answer-giver, but I am very good at questions.

If anything is necessary, it seems to me, it is for all of us to become as truly personal as we can, emotional maybe, exposing ourselves. I think anyone who knows a little bit about elementary photography knows there simply cannot be any development without exposure. We are all holding onto ourselves too much. We must learn to talk to each other again about things that stir us up, the things that frighten us and the things that make us happy.

I believe the ultimate goal of all education, of all civilization, is a harmonious society that consists of autonomous individuals, unsubmissive individuals, each of them having, as someone said the other day, "the stature of one." We all know from our own experience that we can have meaningful relationships only with people we know, people who have exposed themselves to us. And it seems to me this applies not just to people, but to groups and to nations. Common sense is becoming quite rare in an age of experts, frozen in their disciplines, communicating only with electronic computers. I am not surprised that common sense is getting lost. I once read an interesting story of a colonial lady, I presume in Indonesia, who was annoyed by a native servant who wanted to know something. She finally asked him in exasperation: "Why don't you use your common sense?" He said, "Madam, common sense is a gift of God. I have only had a technical education." I think too many of us have only had a technical education.

I would like to cite three quotations that might serve as mottoes for what I have in mind. The first one is by a Dane—Kierkegaard: "Nothing, nothing, nothing, no error, no crime is so absolutely repugnant to God as everything that is official; and why? Because the official is impersonal and, therefore, the deepest insult which can be offered to a personality." The second quotation is by an Englishman, also writing more than a century ago, John Ruskin in The Stones of Venice: "The great cry that rises from all our manufacturing cities, louder than their furnace blasts is that we manufacture everything there except men." And the third quotation was written last year by a Japanese survivor of Hiroshima: "We have reached the conclusion," he said, "that inhumanity begins with the contempt and neglect of the individual. The atomic weapon is the end product of this indifference toward the many individual, inexchangeable and irreplaceable human beings."

The quotations raise the question: can you be personal on television? It seems such an impersonal medium, so incapable of being talked back to. I think potentially television can be as personal as people talking around a camp fire, or in a living room, where, in fact, I have joined you now and you are listening to me. Television has this great and crucial advantage over all other mass media: that it presents a person, not a disembodied voice, not a nameless editorial writer. I think I know, really intimately now, the marvelous NAACP lawyer, Percy Sutton, whom I saw on the ABC program last week. I think I know Robert Oppenheimer from the Murrow program; and I think all of us got to know that senator from Wisconsin, McCarthy, one summer. We got to know him really well, and that was the beginning of the end for him.

The big question is how do we at this end of the camera* involve you? This introduction will serve to give you the rules of the game, to tell you what I have in mind. Basically, I would like to adapt the essay form to television, with some minor changes. One way to describe the essay form is to say that it is translating the speaking voice into print. (Here I can skip the translation process. All you are going to get here is my speaking voice, my presence, basically my face, that semaphore that sticks up on top of my body.) Montaigne, the man who created the essay, named it very aptly. Essayer in French means: to try, to test, to experiment. An essay is free wheeling, very informal, highly personal; often it is a fragment of autobiography. And the best of the essays are intimate, they are relaxed, they are frank; they are opinionated, and yet they are also well reasoned and adequately documented. An essay can include almost everything from objective reporting to the most subjective reminiscences. It can speculate, it can describe, it can attack, it can quote, it can doubt. It is a wide open medium, and it fits me. Whatever else an essay is, it is a form in which a man exposes himself, goes out on a limb. An essayist is more than a commentator, although on occasion, of course, a commentator turns out really fine essays. I don't know whether you heard Howard K. Smith on radio after he had watched the first mob attacks on the freedom riders. His report was an essay of the highest merit.

---

*The reader is reminded that these remarks were delivered over television. Subsequent references to camera and film should also be read in that context.

But Michel de Montaigne himself put the matter most clearly: "Authors communicate with the people by some special extrinsic mark. I am the first to do so, by my entire being as Michel de Montaigne not as a grammarian, or a poet or a jurist. If the world complains that I speak too much of myself, I complain that it does not even think of itself." A book of essays of Montaigne has recently come out in a marvelous new translation by Donald Frame. If you don't know it, you ought to buy it. It is available now in three paperback volumes.

But I am not going to compete with a master of the essay like Montaigne, or a contemporary master like the Negro essayist James Baldwin. I am not going to echo them. Because the very point of the essay is that you have to roll your own. It is a self try-out. I am on my own, as every essayist is on his own, and must suffer all the consequences thereof.

In its very nature an essay is a very subjective thing. I speak for me, so my basic prejudices, biases are going to show through. I am aware of some, and some I am not aware of I am sure you will be able to point out to me. My past experiences will show through. Of course, in one crucial respect, I have the edge on all of you. I am the only person that can be me. I am imprisoned in my skin, I am stuck with me, and I hope you keep this in mind. I may not be your cup of tea, but you can always tune me out.

I think we must always be aware of this inevitable subjectivity. The

77

facts rarely speak for themselves. In the following efforts you are going to get my response to them. At the same time, I can promise you that you will get all the relevant facts that bear on the problems I discuss. While I don't intend to be comprehensive, I try to get to the heart of the matters I discuss as closely as my scholarship, my sensitivity, my background, and my sense of integrity allow. I owe you all the accuracy, all the succinctness, all the freshness I am capable of. That may not be enough, in which case we can call this whole thing off, but I am going to try.

The one thing I do not want to be—and maybe I am that already, I don't know—is a lecturer or a salesman or a politician in my approach. I am not running for any office, I am not trying to sell anything. I like to be a person talking to people, and that is difficult. I am new to you and it may be a while before I hit the right tone. And in the process I may say things that are distasteful to some of you and pleasant to some others. In either case, whatever I say here is not meant as an apology for anything or as an advocacy of anything except a do-it-yourself trend in thinking and feeling.

One of my major aims is to combat what Dean Francis Chase of the University of Chicago School of Education calls the higher illiteracy; he defines it as the inability to entertain ideas which threaten one's view of the world. I think we all suffer from this ailment, and maybe we can help each other in effecting something of a cure. I think that some of my opinions may be repugnant to some of you. I don't want you to accept them. I have trouble enough with them myself. But I do want you to consider them. I want you to take issue with them. I will not always be right, but I hope at least to be wrongheaded provocatively. I think I will have to make it my business not to mind my own business, and I will make mistakes. When I do I hope I can winkle some of my learned colleagues out of their libraries and their laboratories and their classrooms to set me right.

On occasion, of course, I will step on sensitive toes. I hope that all of you remember that academic freedom involves not just the right to be right, but the right to be wrong and the right to change one's mind. I ought to say that I do not believe in controversy for its own sake, the elegant game of playing the devil's advocate without involving yourself, using controversy as a public relations device. I'll stand behind what I say until proven wrong.

Now what subjects will I deal with? Mostly the subjects that interest me personally, the subjects that I like, the subjects that I know something about. They won't always be original, but I think the way I put things together may sometimes be original. Let me give you some examples of subjects I am considering. I would like to talk, for example, about this whole farce of the Civil War commemorations. People have talked about it already, but I have something to say about it too. I would like to talk about the matter of whether we need a secretary of culture. I have a nostalgia for windmills and lighthouses. I would like to talk about censorship. I would like to talk about the uniqueness of my home province. I would like to talk about Dutch landscape painting. I would like also to talk about what I think of the Berlin crisis. I live in this world, and it affects me also.

In general I would like to serve as a kind of cultural Consumer's Union, talking about films or ignored books. I would like to talk about spying, and is it any use. I would like to talk about a number of subjects, some personal, some not too personal. But in any case, what I am going to be doing here is to take my mind for a public walk. I will speak out, not as a self-indulgence, but to make things clear to myself, and maybe in the very process I will make things a little clearer for some of you. In a sense, I will be speaking a personal editorial, and you are invited to write letters to the editor or come talk to the editor.

There is much talk nowadays about civil defense. I want to do my part. I want to build little verbal shelters against the fallout of the mass media and some of the nonsense that appears in them. But that's not all. These essays are an experiment, and they are likely to surprise me, too. There is one more thing I believe: that there is never a final word on any subject.

ESSAYS ON PRINCIPLE

Three of the four papers in this section were prepared as memoranda to the Oregon Extension Staff; the other, "The University and Educational Television," was presented on a television series.

In "University Extension and Program Development," Deinum argues that university extension must do more than manage the programs of other educational departments. If it is to be a genuine educational division, it must give direct attention to creative programing.

"The University and Educational Television" deals with a subject introduced in several of the essays in this collection—television as an educational medium. Deinum discovers characteristics for university ETV by setting its ideal objectives against commercial television.

"Teaching and the Use of Film as Film" expresses Deinum's ideas about the value of film study for young people and adults in the modern world, exploring the many special virtues he sees in the medium.

In "Continuing Higher Education: An Essay in Quotations," the author uses quotations to express the basic principles underlying his philosophy of adult education. He argues, "When others say something really well, I would be a fool not to use their phrases rather than my own inadequate ones." In this tour de force, Deinum ranges far and wide through literature and philosophy to find the writings that state his case.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT*

It seems to me that before we can concentrate meaningfully on the purposes of a general extension division, we must resolve the contradiction between an extension's *assigned* function and its *expected* function. I, for one, need clarification on this basic issue.

Our assigned function is purely administrative. Directives often call us "an administrative unit . . . providing the management"; we are to extend opportunities for continuing higher education. Since we have no offerings of our own involving course credit and degrees, our curriculum comes to us ready-made, as it were, from other institutions, and requires management, and nothing more. Unlike all other educational institutions, we have no "mission" beyond administration.

On the other hand, our expected function implicitly goes much beyond administration, and, in fact, includes some challenging, primarily *creative* missions. Our educational media, for instance, are clearly not just pipelines for other institutions to use for the easy transportation of *their* offerings to the public. Rather they are *our* responsibility to shape creatively, to make exciting and relevant, capable of attracting and satisfying constantly larger and more diverse state-wide audiences.

In Oregon we have one specific assignment, which is uniquely ours and not that of the other institutions in our State System of Higher Education: namely, "to provide the State with a program of continuing education . . . informal, without credit." Here, it has long seemed to me, lies the heart of future extension activities. And I gather that we are moving more and more in this direction and away from our almost exclusive concern with credit offerings, even though we will undoubtedly keep a number of them.

This assignment calls for a program development committee, and the need for one points up a contradiction, for it must be a committee that is a creative, originating force. I am not suggesting that administrators are necessarily non-creative, but that they usually lack the time for creativity. Nor am I saying that activities so far have shown no signs of creativity. Still, all too frequently such originality has been incidental, partial, not suitable to our situation and, worst of all, has not been taken seriously as a higher educational effort.

---

*A memorandum to the dean, June 4, 1962.

I believe that only in non-credit work can extension develop a distinctive identity of its own, become truly an institution in itself. In the credit field we are necessarily a mere administrative vehicle, a carrier-wave on which others speak. In the non-credit field we will at last have a voice of our own, and will need to worry no more about whether people know who we are.

In Oregon, our extension is already responsible for the five public voices of the State System of Higher Education: two television channels, two radio stations, and the film department. Already, the aptness and fluency of these voices speaks for us as the General Extension Division, whether we are aware of it or not. To make these voices speak clearly, provocatively, and learnedly (in the best sense of that word) is basically a creative and not an administrative function. In addition, we must make these voices speak in harmony, in co-ordination whenever possible, in order to obtain the maximum effect at the lowest cost. But the problems —and the challenge, to be sure—are much larger than educational media.

In order to meet the challenge, I believe it must be established that extension is more than an assembly of administrators who facilitate the distribution of the creative work of others. Extension work—now more than ever—must be a creative act in itself, as all good teaching is. It calls above all for innovation, for new kinds of energies, for a blending of scholarship and eloquence. It calls for the ability to restructure credit courses for non-credit purposes. Even more important, it calls for the creation of entirely new offerings of interest to entirely new audiences. It calls for the ability and for the scope to make connections between academic disciplines, to form a usable synthesis of knowledge from many fields, excitingly structured to hold new "non-captive" audiences. It calls for a great deal more, but there is no need to elaborate at this time.

Until extension work is accepted at the highest levels of the university, until this change in focus is appreciated, meaningful discussion of purposes seems premature.

THE UNIVERSITY AND EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION*

Last year I found myself quite accidentally in educational television; I am still not altogether sure why, and what I ought to be doing. So during my recent absence I got to musing about it, not so much about what it is —you can discover that for yourselves—but about what I would like it to be, about the kind of operation I would like to be part of. Speculate along with me, if you care. What follows are my notions, not the dean's, or my colleagues' or the State Board's. It may be foolhardy for me, a virtual layman in television, to express them in front of so many experts. Sort of like expounding Catholicism to the Pope. But I understand that has been done, too.

As a starting point I want to reflect on what I believe some of the differences are between educational and commercial television. Right off there is a difference: I give these talks without having to check with anyone. We have no staff censors, no continuity acceptance. Here academic freedom rules, properly wedded to academic responsibility. Howard K. Smith, for one, learned recently that on CBS, at least, a responsible and proven person cannot just talk or make comments without checking with his bosses.

I cannot work without a sense of purpose. No person, or institution can do much effectively without one. Higher education specifically, but other aspects of American life too, have been criticized recently for lacking purpose, aim, direction. Santayana's definition of a fanatic comes to mind—"a person who redoubles his efforts after having lost sight of his objective." Much contemporary activity consists of a redoubling of effort after completely losing sight of an objective, if there ever was one in the first place.

The broad purposes of educational and commercial television can be compared. One thing we clearly have in common is the same airwaves. And they are yours, as the rivers of the country are yours. You hold the franchise to them, through the Federal Communications Commission. Unfortunately most of you don't seem to care much about this valuable possession. Must another national resource be despoiled, and washed down a Mississippi of bad taste?

---

*Edited transcript of "E.T.V. and C.T.V." from the educational television series, Speaking for Myself, February 26, 1962, KOAC-TV and KOAP-TV.

You support commercial television by buying things. But you own educational television by being taxpayers of this state. All of you, in effect, have become patrons of culture, as the Medici were in the Renaissance or millionaires are in our era. You ought to work at this patron-business as hard, and as knowledgeably, as they did.

Educational and commercial television have basic techniques in common. Television is very aptly called a "medium"; Webster's Unabridged defines "medium" as "that which lies in the middle, or a middle condition, a mean." Two meanings come to mind: a connection, a bridge; and connotations of mediocrity. Also, and this is relevant, a medium is "a substance through which a force acts or an effect is transmitted."

Perhaps the substance of television is an art, or can be, or will be. As a longtime teacher of film theory I am probably prejudiced. It seems to me that most of television's present means of expression are derived either from film or from theatre. To me the unique powers of television lie in its ability to do justice to the immediate, the present, the here-and-now, in its qualities of unpremeditatedness, and consequently its frequent revelation of the false as well as the genuine. Anyway I'm not much concerned about art at this point. But I am concerned about television as a medium "through which a force acts." The key question to me is: which forces are acting through our television channels, and for what purposes?

In comparing the two, I am sure I don't need to spell out for you what commercial television is. You all know: it's that one-eyed salesman who has taken up permanent residence in your living room; it's the box you are now looking at, when it is not tuned to this channel. I won't join in the current attacks on commercial television. I am only interested in the differences between commercial and educational television. In any case, it's all been said, and pity is not called for. Commercial television will survive; it has never been healthier. Television network earnings jumped from about $10 million in 1952 to $95 million in 1960, roughly a 1000 per cent gain in eight years. In 1950 the investment by advertisers in television was $170,800,000; in 1960 it was $1,605,000,000; revenues have increased exactly 939 per cent in ten years. Clearly the airwaves are gold mines, if I may join The New York Times in mixing a metaphor. It is interesting to note that program quality apparently went down as profits went up. It is disconcerting to hear about the "golden age of television"—as long ago as the early fifties.

We are an educational channel, more specifically a higher educational channel. I am aware that we have instructional and community functions also, but there is no reason why these cannot be performed in the spirit and on the level I am about to discuss. You remember the line about one's reach exceeding one's grasp.

Being a part of a State System of Higher Education is a great benefit potentially. It gives us great resources on which we have barely begun to draw. But, more importantly, it gives us a framework, a set of goals, an ancient and honorable and tested attitude. This home we have within a university community gives us an advantage many other educational stations lack and may come to envy.

I am not going to lecture you about higher education. But I do want to remind you that always at the heart of the concept of a university has been the encouragement of intellectual curiosity, of freedom of investigation, of critical judgment, of imagination, and above all, of a sense of values. Historically, universities have been treasured not alone for the services they render, but even more for the values they represent. The current criticism of the American college is aimed precisely, I believe, at recalling them to their root function, away from excessive concern with services, buildings, endowments, administration, toward the student and his individual development, toward teaching, toward the teachers.

Professor Edgar Johnson, writing about universities in the Middle Ages, called them then "a new instrument of persuasion in a world dominated by force." They still are, and educational television ought to consider itself a new extension of this by now old, and well-worn but still equally vital instrument in a world more than ever dominated by force, in which the "engineering of consent" is beginning to replace persuasion on a large scale. Alfred North Whitehead, the philosopher and mathematician, described the function of a university succinctly and eloquently.

His description can double as a statement of essential purpose of educational television. Let me read it to you slowly:

> The university imparts information, but it imparts it imaginatively. At least this is the function which it should perform for society. A university which fails in this respect has no reason for existence. This atmosphere of excitement, arising from imaginative consideration, transforms knowledge. A fact is no longer a bare fact; it is invested with all its possibilities. It is no longer a burden on the memory; it is energising as the poet of our dreams, and as the architect of our purposes.

An educational television station that imparts information unimaginatively, uncreatively, has no reason for existence, either.

As a part of the General Extension Division, our business is to an ever-larger degree what is now called continuing higher education. While formal and professional education is fine and necessary, it has done little to counteract the drift toward "mass-man," the alienated person, the "higher illiterate," the "everyman" who is rapidly becoming an island, in spite of John Donne. Our era is characterized by immensely skillful people, operating in almost hermetically-sealed compartments of society, frighteningly skillful, in fact, but not very wise on the evidence.

With educational television, we must build bridges between people, between groups, between specialists, between academic disciplines. We must show connections and unsuspected relationships. We must help ourselves, and others, find what Boris Pasternak called "our own insights into our relationship with the existence in which we participate so briefly." The idea of humanity as guests of existence is disturbing and provocative at the same time; it should infuse our thinking.

In doing this job we will often be demanding, but like all good education not necessarily forbidding, or pedestrian and dull. Using the imagination Whitehead called for, we must impart the very feel of the facts, their human consequences. And as we do this we must accept the once proud designation of "intellectual," of people committed to the discovery of connections. We must accept being called "eggheads," too. I would like those who are scornful of "eggheads" to know that the genuine article does not come soft, but quite hardboiled.

Of course, we don't hold a monopoly on learning or culture in educational television. Commercial television has occasionally done brilliantly there. But I feel we can do it better, mostly because we can cover subjects in depth, without distracting interruptions. Commercial television schedules rarely allow for this. It's a part-time assignment to them; it is our sole reason for existence.

We haven't done too well yet. We have been, consciously or unconsciously, snobbish, quite frequently condescending. We have often forgotten that culture is for everyone, that everyone to varying degrees participates in it, is formed by it. Art, science, all of it is something to be understood, assimilated as essential equipment for living for all of us. Particularly now, when several revolutions are occurring simultaneously, the need for constant extension of general human awareness is pressing.

Another important difference to me is the fact that commercial television is a mass medium, with a built-in requirement for mass appeal, for the widest possible audiences of potential customers. Educational television is not a mass medium. We are dedicated to the very opposite: to the breaking up of captive audiences, of submissive crowds, into acting, thinking individuals making up their own minds. We do not only appeal to minority audiences; our mission is to create, by our programing, as many critical, independent audiences as we can. Ratings are blissfully irrelevant to us. To the mass media, to commercial television the audience is a "media market." To us you are simply people, no more. But what more could be wanted?

C. Wright Mills, the Columbia sociologist, once wrote: "in this expanded world of mechanically vivified communications, the capacity for experience is alienated and the individual becomes the spectator of everything, but the human witness of nothing." In educational television we want human witnesses, reacting humanly: warmly or cantankerously, it doesn't matter, as long as they respond somehow.

One of the main rules of commercial television is: don't offend! It is an understandable rule since you don't deliberately antagonize your customers; but in spite of this commercial stations, remarkably, do sometimes go out on limbs. It is encouraging that they do sometimes take unpopular stands in their public service programs. Educational television, to be sure, does not go out of its way to offend people; but it is dedicated to the age-old aim of genuine education: to raise questions, to unsettle, to stimulate, to annoy—like Socrates.

Are you looking more now, and enjoying it less? Or have you quit looking altogether? Educational television is based on the belief that you indeed want more than you are now getting from commercial television. But I do not mean that we are merely a supplement to commercial television, an intellectual vitamin pill for people with an inadequate diet. Serving as a stop-gap measure, as a sort of medicine would present no real challenge for any of us. What is clearly needed is a complete, adequate diet, and our aim ought to be eventually to provide one, so that people will have a true choice. To me, educational television ought to be an alternative, and in many ways a counter service. We must define and then constitute our own specific identity, in which we can unapologetically take pride. We must stand on our own feet, and develop our own style.

This is why I dislike reference to educational television as the "fourth network." We should remain independent, specific to our areas, as Harvard is different from Stanford, and the University of Oregon from New York University. Our strong points are our local roots, our local responsibilities, our local support and response. Our relationship with you is not, and should not be an impersonal one. A network philosophy would militate, I feel, against a more and more personal approach.

Now what should we do? To spell it out would be outside the aim of this talk; it would be presumptuous at this point. Generally, we should do what commercial television cannot or will not do. But also we should tackle many of the things they do and try to do them better.

This brings me to a much discussed point: namely that commercial television is entertaining, and that we are not. If I can believe my own eyes and ears and those of critics I respect, the level of entertainment on commercial television has been very low lately, unimaginative, and dull. We cannot learn much there, I expect. In any case, this argument rests on a misunderstanding of the word "entertainment." According to even abridged dictionaries "to entertain" means not only "to amuse, to divert" but also "to admit into the mind, to consider" and "to hold in the mind, to harbor, to cherish." In that sense we haven't begun entertaining yet. In this light, we must not imitate but find our own ways of holding our audiences, and we can.

Entertainment can be demanding, and audiences will respect those who respect them in what they offer. Provoked thought can be more entertaining than provoked laughs. Humor is more than gags and vaudeville tricks. What is more entertaining than a fine mind in full flight? Good art, good conversation is by definition entertaining; as is good teaching, for it grips and holds the focused attention of the mind.

What worries me about educational television is not our lack of entertainment values, but the lack of interest of so many fine and capable entertainers—professors of various subjects in our State System. A large part of our talent lies fallow. We talk about educational television as an open marketplace of ideas. What is more interesting than a marketplace, friends?

Dr. Walter Gropius, the great architect, founder of the Bauhaus, received the $20,000 Kaufmann International Design Award in 1961. In his acceptance speech he asked what it would take "to rise above the cloud of fake values which is smothering us." He answered himself: purposeful, intensive education. Then he said: "It seems to be unimaginable that human nature should not rebel against the conspiracy to replace 'the tree of life' with a sales spiral. I hope this generation will, by the power of education, produce men who eventually will blaze a trail out of the commercial jungle."

Speaking solely for myself, but I hope for many of my colleagues as well, I say educational television stands for the tree of life as against the sales spiral and the commercial jungle. Taking this stand will involve us in arguments, but universities are made of arguments. Greater controversies are coming up, and we should provoke them rather than fear them. To play it safe is to play it dead. We need more genuine, mutual cross-examinations between adversaries on issues, like the probing questions and challenges in a courtroom. The great jurist Wigmore called this kind of confrontation "the engine of truth." That is a great phrase. In these times, in this country, only educational television can serve this crucial function as "an engine of truth." We must make it one.

If I may express just one wish for our educational channels, it is that they may become known as the "no nonsense" channels. That alone would make us stations with a difference.

THE TEACHING AND USE OF FILM AS FILM*

Film is the art of our age; not only was it born and developed in it, but—more importantly—it is particularly and uncommonly fitted to express it artistically. Many educators are willing to admit that this youngest of the arts is indeed the most influential, the most pervasive, the most available of the arts. But they usually don't go beyond that admission.

Film may be the widest known but it is also the least understood of the arts. While knowledge about, and insights into the other arts are provided in our primary and secondary schools, film—the only art in which children have a seemingly inborn interest—is left severely alone. Evidence indicates that educators in the United States are concerned with film as a reproductive and recording device, as a vehicle for other arts, as an audio-visual tool on par with a flannel-board, but not as an unparalleled means of expression or something uniquely valuable in itself. Education has been shortchanged by denying itself one of its major potential resources: the intelligent use of film.

There are two main reasons why film as art, film as film should become a part of school curricula. In the first place, in our era of mass culture when we are daily in danger of being "communicated" to death, it is clearly urgent that we foster more worthwhile, more vivifying filmgoing. Not only will such studies engender a finer awareness of what true films offer, but, equally important, they can arm the mind against the artifices and blandishments of the inferior movies that prey on us constantly. It is surely in the democratic tradition to attempt to change passive spectators into alert, discriminating filmgoers with a principled edge to their film appetites. To put it another way: to counteract the anaesthetics of the mass media with the aesthetics of film, teach how to tell a film from a movie, a film from a pseudo-film.

---

*Memorandum to the Development and Evaluation Committee, G.E.D., November 20, 1962.

The second reason for making films a part of school curricula is that full-length as well as shorter films on the level of art offer great opportunities for timesaving, exciting curriculum enrichment in the field of the humanities. This educational use of non-educational films in effect would make some of our most significant modern artists collaborators in the teaching process. As John Stuart Mill pointed out long ago, it is in the artist's hands alone that truth becomes impressive, and a living principle of action. On the effective, time-conserving qualities of art, Shaw very likely had the final word when he remarked that, short of torture, nothing teaches like art.

What is needed then is a comprehensive, many-faceted effort to make film's nature, and its uses, known generally, but especially in education. The best place to start appears to be in the high schools where, I believe, the need and the possible advantages are greatest. I am suggesting as a preliminary step, the establishment of experimental film institutes for high-school teachers; this will help us in determining the further approach to be taken. The problem is not just one of teaching new knowledge and training in new sensibilities, but also one of undoing the effects of decades of misconceptions and intellectual condescension which have regarded film as a subject unworthy of serious study.

Let me spell out in more detail why film, of all the humanities, is so very relevant to us. Film, the art of moving images, is inherently capable of dealing with a moving, ever-changing world. Times of rapid transition seem to require an art in which rapid transitions are possible. The very discontinuity of our world picture, and the resulting need for synthesis, are reflected in film, the art of discontinuity and synthesis. Our modern scientific concepts of time and space find artistic equivalents in the relativity of film time and film space.

Film, alone of the arts, can display fully rounded, infinitely complicated human beings within their actual environment, interacting with it, and with each other; thus, it can show us the very processes of contemporary living as they occur. Film alone, therefore, can reveal the crucial connections between man and his world, between character and surrounding, between the human and the ever-more-pressing non-human. (In film not just human characters are dramatically active, but everything visible, no matter its nature, can and does work as an agent; this makes the critical difference.) Some of the other arts, to be sure, can attempt this, consecutively and abstractly, but only film can do it simultaneously, as an observable event, and non-abstractly.

True film keeps us in meaningful touch with our surroundings by giving us, not just the facts, but like good art, the "feel" of the facts, essential for understanding. It does not seem coincidental that the rise of film went hand in hand with the rise of mass society, of urban society, which film is so uniquely equipped to represent and interpret as an experience.

The teaching of film as art can also be a great aid in helping students toward a better understanding of the arts in general. Since most young people are already "hooked" on it, analysis of the methods, processes, and effects of films will serve as lucid, interesting examples of much that is more difficult to comprehend in the older arts. And so film appreciation can become, in effect, art appreciation, and a potent force in exhibiting and spreading the values of the humanities—equally pertinent to contemporary living as those of the sciences.

The teaching with film as art will provide penetrating images of our world impossible to the other arts. Using film at its best we can impart a sense of the actual world everywhere in all its aspects, applicable to every subject area. We can give a meaningful and needed exposure to the many worlds of modern man; for film is not just a form of intellectual education (many audio-visual media can do that), it is emotional education as well—an education in values—in which the emotions match the motions of the images. And finally, teaching with genuinely fine films is pleasurable education, an education with built-in motivation.

CONTINUING HIGHER EDUCATION: AN ESSAY IN QUOTATIONS*

I

"To continue, to continue, that is what is necessary. But you will ask: what is your definite aim? That aim becomes more definite, will stand out slowly and surely . . . little by little by working seriously on it, by pondering over the idea, vague at first, over the thought that was fleeting and passing, till it gets fixed."

Vincent van Gogh

"The highest function of education is to help people understand the meaning of their lives, and become more sensitive to the meaning of other peoples' lives and relate to them more fully."

Edgar Z. Friedenberg

"During the nineteenth century . . . mankind sought security in money, land, and things. Man's dream of security was heaviness and stability. Today mankind has realized that there is no security in property. This applies not only to Russians. In this era of World Wars, in this atomic age, values have changed. We have learned that we are the guests of existence, travelers between two stations. We must discover security within ourselves. During our short span of life we must find our own insights into our relationship with the existence in which we participate so briefly. Otherwise we cannot live."

Boris Pasternak

"There is no right education except growing up into a worthwhile world. Indeed, our excessive concern with the problems of education at present simply means that the grownups do not have such a world. A decent education aims at, prepares for, a more worthwhile future, with a different community spirit, different occupations, and more real utility, than attaining status and salary."

---

*Originally prepared as a background paper for the Program Planning Committee, Oregon State System of Higher Education, Division of Continuing Education.

Paul Goodman

"Until kids learn from their elders to respect that man who carries his wealth between his ears as much as the one who drives it around in a glitter of chrome, we're going to get into deeper and deeper trouble."

Bill Mauldin

"Competition may be the life-blood of commerce, but it is the ruin of the human mind."

William Butler Yeats

II

"It seems to me that in a democratic society we can never have a set of purposes; we can only have the on-going problem of purposes. As a movement then, adult education must assume as its basis a continuing pattern of changing conflicts and controversies . . . I believe that a movement that recognizes conflict and controversy as its basis is a movement of intellectual excitement and potential growth."

John B. Schwertman

"Our educational needs are going to continue to multiply in the years ahead. Adult education in general will be called upon to perform functions that it is not now capable of doing . . . It must provide avenues and areas in which responsible, mature citizens can gain and evaluate new experiences that are appropriate to our ever-changing society. It can do that better if adult education, as a whole, gets on with some desperately needed housecleaning."

Frank G. Jennings

"I believe a life without theory has come to an end in the United States. A search for principles has begun. We have been absent-minded. Now at last we have to apply our minds. We have to think. And the task of revitalizing the American Creed and creatively reinterpreting it and making it once more the light and hope of the world is primarily an intellectual task."

Robert M. Hutchins

"To speak today of the defense of democracy as if we are defending something which we knew and had possessed for many decades or many centuries is self-deception and sham—mass democracy is a new phenomenon—a creation of the last half-century—which it is inappropriate and misleading to consider in terms of the philosophy of Locke or of the liberal democracy of the nineteenth century. We should be nearer the mark, and should have a far more convincing slogan if we spoke of the need, not to defend democracy, but to create it."

E. H. Carr

"A free society is created by the thoughts, utterances, and actions of the people who are alive in it . . . A free society is the sum of millions upon millions of individual decisions. Any decision that is enhancing and enlarging and life-expanding is a contribution—minute perhaps, but definite—to the affirmative side of culture. Similarly, any decision that is slack, sterile and negative is by just that much destructive of the society."

Margaret Halsey

"A man is free, or he enjoys liberty, in the proportion to which his life is governed by his own choice. Freedom is not doing as one pleases, but doing as one chooses . . . liberal education . . . makes . . . men awar of the widest range of possibilities by the discovery of new possibilities and by reminding of old possibilities forgotten. It does so in order that men may choose with the utmost amplitude of freedom."

Ralph Barton Perry

III

"Man wants to know, and when he ceases to do so he is no longer man."

Fridtjof Nansen

"I would address one general admonition to all: that they consider what are the true ends of knowledge, and that they seek it not either for the pleasure of the mind, or for contention, or for superiority to others, or for profit, or fame, or power, or any of these inferior things; but for the benefit and use of life."

Francis Bacon

"[Wisdom] . . . should denote a certain intimate union of knowledge with apprehension of human destiny and the purposes of life. It requires a certain breadth of vision, which is hardly possible without considerable knowledge. But it demands, also, a breadth of feeling, a certain kind of universality of sympathy.

"I think that higher education should do what is possible toward promoting not only knowledge, but wisdom. I do not think that this is easy; and I do not think that the aim should be too conscious, for, if it is, it becomes stereotyped and priggish. It should be something existing almost unconsciously in the teacher and conveyed almost unintentionally to the pupil."

Bertrand Russell

"To feel emotion is at least to feel. The crime against life, the worst of all crimes is not to feel. And there was never perhaps a civilization in which that crime, the crime of torpor, of lethargy, of apathy, the snake-like sin of coldness-at-the-heart, was commoner than in our technological civilization."

Archibald MacLeish

"The Western world has failed in its dealing with Asia because it lacked subtlety. They are extraordinarily lacking in any approach to mind and heart and, therefore, they fail.

Jawaharlal Nehru

IV

"The humanities are, then, a group of subjects devoted to the study of man as a being other than a biological product and different from a social or sociological entity . . . they assume that man lives in a dimension lying beyond science and the social sciences . . . that his profound sense of individuation is one of the most important things about him . . .

they assume that the better traits of humanity . . . find typical expression in philosophy, in literature, in language and in the arts, and that history is both the way by which these expressions are preserved and one of the principal modes of interpreting the meaning of these expressions to and in contemporary life."

Howard Mumford Jones

"The function of a University is to enable you to shed details in favour of principles. When I speak of principles I am hardly even thinking of verbal formulations. A principle which has thoroughly soaked into you is rather a mental habit than a formal statement."

A. N. Whitehead

"The 'explosion of knowledge' does not mean . . . the multiplication of full-grown ideas. It has often meant the fragmentation of attention to some new particle of the same world man has confronted from the beginning of time . . . To scatter the attention of students to the increasing fragments of knowledge, to open up new courses, to survey more and more branches of so-called learning, is, therefore, to multiply their confusion. To offer a drowning man a drink of water would be as impertinent as to offer a student more fragments of knowledge than he knows how to assimilate.

"Education in its deeper reaches consists more in generating principles of organization than in multiplication of fragmentation."

Louis William Norris

"Education and culture are not yet on speaking terms in our country. Specializations should no longer be so much encouraged. There are enough of these speculative partialities to fill the infinite pigeonholes of our vast capitalist system and its multiple bureaus . . . in this mechanized nation of salesmen . . . The university then should function as the vision of society with the courage of an honest radical's conviction . . . A true university would strive to deepen and preserve ideals of underlying principles evident as naturally superior. The university then would be the very lifeline of democracy—which it should exist only to serve."

Frank Lloyd Wright

V

"What is the task of the liberal college for adults? . . . the first answer is: to keep us from being overwhelmed. Its first and continuing task is to help produce the disciplined and informed mind that cannot be overwhelmed . . . to help develop the bold and sensible individual who cannot be overwhelmed by the burdens of modern life."

C. Wright Mills

"We are all conceived in close prison . . . and then all our life is but a going out to the place of execution, of death. Nor was there any man seen to sleep in the cart between Newgate and Tyburn—between prison and the place of execution does any man sleep? But we sleep all the way; from the womb to the grave we are never thoroughly awake."

John Donne

"Those who are awake have a world in common, but every sleeper has a world of his own."

Heraclitus

"The number of those who need to be awakened is far greater than that of those who need comfort."

Bishop Wilson

"One chief aim of any true system of education must be to impart to the individual the courage to play the game against any and all odds, the nerve to walk into the ambushes of existence, the hardness to face the most despicable truth about himself and not let it daunt him permanently; it must armor him with an ultimate carelessness."

Don Marquis

VI

"For me, the purposes of adult education must be derived from three sources. These sources make different, and sometimes conflicting, demands . . . The three sources are our cultural tradition—the best that man has thought and said and done; the needs of a society that is politically organized as a democracy; and the psycho-social needs of adults in this kind of society."

John B. Schwertman

"What, then, is culture ideally . . .? . . . We are not talking about culture as a leisure time activity, as entertainment alone; nor simply as that part of the communal work which never earns its own pay and must therefore be supported by tax-exempt donations. Nor is it an affair of snobs. Nor exclusively of universities. Nor of impresarios . . . culture in its deepest sense is the whole life of the human spirit in communities.

"The life of the human spirit has three notable aspects: it lives only through its concern with itself, it lives or seeks to live on the plane of lucidity, and it expresses itself in objective works. Now these three features are nothing but functions; functioning together, they create culture."

William Earle

"What the evening college ought to do for the community is to fight all those forces which are destroying genuine publics and creating an urban mass; or stated positively: to help build and to strengthen the self-cultivating liberal public. For only that will set them free."

C. Wright Mills

"A great public is entitled to our respect, and should not be treated like children from whom one wishes merely to extract money. By accustoming them to what is good, we may lead them gradually to feel and to appreciate the excellent, and they will pay their money with double satisfaction when their reason and understanding approve the outlay."

Johann von Goethe

"Hamlet: Why, look you now, how unworthy a thing you make of me! You would play upon me . . . Call me what instrument you will, though you can fret me, yet you cannot play upon me."

William Shakespeare

"A university should not be a weather vane, responsive to every variation of popular whim. Universities must at times give society, not what society wants, but what it needs."

Abraham Flexner

"The nation needs to preserve safe havens where ruthless examination of realities will not be distorted by the aim to please or inhibited by the risk of displeasure."

Kingman Brewster, Jr.

"Beyond the need for explanation of the practical, beyond the need for information, there will always be the need for a community of meaning and understanding. To my mind this is a basic and central need. It is a very grave circumstance of our time that the overwhelming part of new knowledge is available only to a few people and does not enrich common understanding . . . It means that an understanding of the scope, depth, and nature of our ignorance should be among the primary purposes of education . . . for the coherence of our culture, and for the very future of any free civilization."

J. Robert Oppenheimer

"The true function of scholarship as of society is not to stake out claims on which others must not trespass, but to provide a community of knowledge in which others may share."

F. O. Matthiessen

VII

"If I had my way, I would admit to the band of men and women dedicated to the cause of adult education only those who . . . would vow themselves with all their hearts to the service of what seems to me the true purpose of adult education: to break up the dumb, submissive crowd into active, thinking, unsubmissive individuals."

Dorothy Canfield Fisher

"The need to create sound syntheses and systematization of knowledge, to be taught in the 'Faculty of Culture,' will call out a kind of scientific genius which hitherto has existed only as an aberration, the genius for integration."

Ortega y Gasset

"An unflinching determination to take the whole evidence into account is the only method of preservation against the fluctuating extremes of fashionable opinion."

A. N. Whitehead

"One of the intellectual's principal functions in society: to serve as a symbol and as a reminder of the fundamental fact that the seemingly autonomous, disparate and disjointed morsels of social existence . . . can be understood (and influenced) only if they are clearly visualized as parts of the comprehensive totality of the historical process."

Paul A. Baran

"The value . . . [an intellectual] has for the university depends largely on his insistence that he remain the ill-adjusted creature he previously was . . . At evident cost and probably gain, the intellectual must continue 'to watch his mind' as his students watch it with him. And this is hard, for somehow the intellectual must maintain his spontaneity of work while in part allowing it to become a visible public act."

Irving Howe

"Motivation is the most important factor in the learning process. Motivation comes from exposure to exciting people and exciting minds."

O. Meredith Wilson

"It is time that colleges recognize that complete objectivity is impossible. We must have teachers who are both inspiring and disturbing, who set for the student an example of commitment and who are protected by the college in the free voicing of this commitment.

"This is the risk which higher education must be willing to take for the sake of the student, if it is to avoid a deadening and frustrating neutrality in answering the great issues of our time."

Edward D. Eddy, Jr.

"A scholar should be the first to become concerned with this world's troubles and the last to rejoice in its happiness."

Chinese, 1043

"Essentially, there is only one type of good professor. He is learned, enthusiastic about learning, original, emphatic, innately suspicious of rules and regulations that endeavor to uniformize personalities, more eager to encourage students than to judge them."

George Williams

"The function of the teacher is to present problems, not solutions; to give yeast, not bread. Truth does not fall into the student's mouth like a ripe apple."

Noah Jonathan Jacobs

"Liberty, like reason, does not exist or manifest itself except by constant disdain of its own works; it perishes as soon as it is filled with self-approval. That is why humor has always been a characteristic of philosophical and liberal genius, the seal of the human spirit, the irresistible instrument of progress. Stagnant people are always solemn people; the man of a people that laughs is a thousand times closer to reason and liberty than the anchorite who prays or the philosopher who argues."

Pierre Joseph Proudhon

VIII

"Our American scholarly tradition . . . places excessive emphasis on fact-finding, compilations and surveys. The tendency so often is to plunge to the bottom of a spoonful of facts in order to emerge with an explanation of the obvious. Narrow diligence and mechanical modes of thought frequently take the place of speculative wisdom and courageous generalizations."

Ernest J. Simmons

"Wisdom is a butterfly, and not a gloomy bird of prey."

William Butler Yeats

"An academic career puts a young man into a kind of embarrassing position, by requiring him to produce scientific publications in impressive quantity—a seduction into superficiality which only strong characters are able to withstand."

Albert Einstein

"In my view the only good academic administrator is a reluctant administrator. By that I mean his heart should really be in teaching and research. In fact, he should combine active teaching with administration if at all possible."

Philip H. Rhinelander

"He who learns from one occupied in learning drinks of a running stream. He who learns from one who has learned all he is to teach drinks 'the green mantle of the stagnant pool.'"

A. J. Scott

"So long as there is any subject which men may not freely discuss, they are timid upon all subjects. They wear an iron crown and talk in whispers."

John Jay Chapman

"Our colleges will be measurably better the day deans become the clerical servants of the faculty. A faculty incapable of self-determination is incapable of governing a classroom dedicated to the discipline of mind in good order."

John Ciardi

IX

"It is the task of the liberal institution, as of the liberally educated man, continually to translate troubles into issues and issues into the terms of their human meaning for the individual."

C. Wright Mills

"To be a particular individual is world-historically absolutely nothing, infinitely nothing—and yet this is the only true and highest significance of a human being, so much higher as to make every other significance illusory."

Sören Kierkegaard

"Concern for man himself and his fate must always form the chief interest of all technical endeavors . . . Never forget this in the midst of your diagrams and equations."

Albert Einstein

"The tree grips soil, the bird
Knows how to use the wind;
But the full man must live
Rooted, yet unconfined."

C. Day Lewis

"Man advances as the whole man, or not at all."

Karl Marx

"To compose our character is our duty, not to compose books, and to win, not battles and provinces, but order and tranquaility in our conduct. Our great and glorious masterpiece is to live appropriately. All other things, ruling, hoarding, building, are only little appendages and props, at most."

Michel de Montaigne

"The only real voyage of discovery, the only Fountain of Youth, consists not in seeking new landscapes, but in having new eyes, in seeing the universe with the eyes of another, of a hundred others, in seeing the hundred universes that each of them sees."

Marcel Proust

ESSAYS IN PRACTICE

The essays in this group were developed for practical situations. In almost every case they were originally prepared for television or as conference addresses. They demonstrate and enlarge upon the principles stated in the preceding essays. But more than that, they have substantive merit as a reflection of a deeply humane person applying his humanity to a variety of contemporary problems largely related to living in our contemporary urban society.

THE HUMANITY OF VAN GOGH[*]

There is no man in the history of art, I think, who has been talked about so much, written about so much, slandered so much, as Van Gogh. He has become a major industry; hundreds are trying to cash in on this man's unhappy life. They have made him into a salable commodity, a sort of titillating myth, a weird legend, a character. My concern, however, is not with Van Gogh as a character, but with the character of Van Gogh; and it was a considerable character.

My qualifications for this—we ought to be clear about that—are not artistic. I'm not an artist nor an art-historian; I'm not a medical man and I'm not a psychiatrist—these are usually the people that talk about Van Gogh. My interest is purely personal, and human. I grew up with this man's paintings; when I go to the museum here, it is like seeing old friends that I remember from my youth. I have a background like his. I come from a long line of Calvinists. I know Dutch history.

But above all, the evidence for what I'm going to say is contained in sources you can go to as easily as I can: the paintings and the man's letters, which are now available in English in a wonderful three-volume set. Of course, I am not going to tell you the whole story, only an essential part of the story—the part that is usually ignored. I think that any Netherlander with my range of interests would tell you the same things about this man that I will. I don't know what will be the total impression of what I am going to say here, but if I do nothing else today I want to bring home to you the understanding that Vincent van Gogh was not that wild-eyed, red-haired young man who once, in a truly demented moment, imagined he was Kirk Douglas.

I don't think that any man, least of all an artist, can be properly understood outside of his background. I don't think that you can understand William Faulkner without knowledge of the South, and I don't think that you can understand Boris Pasternak without a knowledge of Russia and the Soviet Union. Neither can you understand Van Gogh without a thorough knowledge of the Netherlands. So this is the angle that I am going to hit hardest. It is difficult to make pronouncements about national character; yet it stands to reason that the way a nation lives over a long period of time will affect the character of its inhabitants.

---

[*] An edited version of a lecture to the City Club of Portland, reprinted from the PEC Night-Owl, March 1959.

One of the circumstances that have affected the character of the Dutch is the fact that for 2,000 years they have lived under a constant threat of floods; the waters could come over almost any time. I remember the water almost coming over the dikes of my home town once. And it happened in Van Gogh's youth. He was in Dordrecht when that town was flooded.

This has made the Dutch apprehensive; it has made them a somber, blunt, no-nonsense type of people. They were situated in the center of trade routes, and so businessmen became important in the Netherlands. They needed a religion, and they took to a kind of religion that was ideally suited to a business civilization, a religion known as Calvinism, a very austere and practical faith. The Calvinism of the seventeenth century, unlike the Catholicism of that age, according to Crane Brinton, the Harvard historian, not only preached the dignity of labor, but it also insisted upon labor. The slogan was, and you still see it in many Dutch homes to this day, in the little Latin phrase: Ora et Labora—"Pray and work"; and, the implication is, shut up about everything else.

This credo gave people an immense drive, of course; it made them productive. "The devil lies in wait for idle hands" is a perfect motto for a nation of businessmen. This attitude accounts for the amazing drive of Van Gogh, too; he still had it. He turned out his large body of work, over 800 pieces, in less than ten years.

Calvinism is a very ascetic faith: it has whitewashed churches; it forbids decoration of any kind; and it is very sober. It is not mystical, it is not passive, it does not seclude itself from the world—and that is another aspect of it exemplified in Van Gogh. For the Calvinist, you see, the world is the antechamber to Hell and eternal damnation. If you really feel that way about life, you are not likely to be much amused, Mr. Brinton believes. And Van Gogh was not.

Calvinism makes every man into a secret police state all his own, with the conscience playing the part of the spy, the stool pigeon, constantly watching every deed, every thought he has—every man his own cop. This splits a man's character rather considerably; it is a Calvinist form of schizophrenia that Van Gogh suffered from all his life. The clergy ruled the Netherlands then, and the clergymen ran the Dutch towns.

As a reaction to this sort of thing, a number of non-conformist sects grew in the Netherlands, democratic sects. I will mention just one because the man who founded it was born and lived the first forty years of his life in a small village near my home town. Menno Simons was the founder of the Mennonites and a good Frisian Netherlander. And there were many such offshoots, part of a Dutch tradition of evangelism, a sort of utopian, Christian socialism to which Van Gogh was attracted. He was torn between these two poles: the official, rather formidable religion of his father, and the utopian trend.

There was another factor, too. In spite of or because of the austere, autocratic religion and the rigid social control, there developed in the Netherlands a tendency toward unexpected violence, extraordinary bursts of it, in the grip of which the Dutch would suddenly kill statesmen they owed very much to. I think that they were also the first nation that adopted what we now call the "scorched earth" policy, thinking nothing of opening their dikes and flooding half of their country to keep the enemy out.

And, of course, if you really want to know what this kind of Calvinism is like—and it had this form in the nineteenth century when Van Gogh lived—all you have to do is look at South Africa today where the Boers are still practicing this virulent form of Calvinism, which they keep alive in all its pristine horror.

Now let's take a quick look at the nineteenth century, to give you a little background. In the first place, during the first part of the century the Netherlands was a dismal intellectual place, apathetic and inert. Then you get the great watershed of the year 1848, when many spectres began to haunt Europe, not just the spectre of Marxism. Van Gogh was born on this side of the watershed, in 1853. Within a few years of his birth, on either side of it, almost all of the people responsible for the present-day intellectual and cultural climate in the Netherlands were born. He was not unique, he was not by himself, he was no freakish mutation. All the people who took part in the revival of the eighties which is so important in Dutch culture—the poets, the writers, the painters, the scientists, the engineers—were born about that time. I don't want to bore you with any other odd sounding names, but you can take my word for it: he was born in excellent company.

Internationally speaking, the point needs to be made, too, that Van Gogh was very definitely part of that significant intellectual resistance movement of the nineteenth century made up of all those rough and blunt and self-taught artists who kept breaking the molds in their various fields. People like Mark Twain, Dickens, and Walt Whitman, Daumier, and Moussorgsky, and Thoreau, and finally people like Maxim Gorky. All of these people were, in effect, seismographs that were registering shifts going on deep down in society and as yet unfelt by their contemporaries.

All of these people had a number of things in common. They felt a deep solidarity with common people, they believed that society had reached an impasse and that thorough renewal was needed. These artists didn't just look at the working class from a distance, they lived with them, as Van Gogh did.

These people had much to say, but they were searching for a way of saying it. They didn't like the old forms, the academic forms, so they shaped their own. This is true of Whitman, this is true of Van Gogh, and of the others too. None of these people were willing to withdraw into a private world, even though they were much exposed to misunderstanding, abuse, and privation. And all—and this was very typical of them, and significant—they all reached out for mass audiences, and eventually they all got them.

These people, to my mind, were the collective conscience of their age, of the nineteenth century; and our century, such as it is, would have been even worse off if it hadn't been for them. Like all genuine artists, they were, by nature and by fate, spies in enemy territory. That is what William Faulkner was in the South, whether the Southerners realize it or not, and that surely is what Boris Pasternak was in Russia, and they realize it!

Now, how Dutch was this man? Read his letters; almost every letter is full of allusions to his youth, and what it meant to him, and to the people he knew. I want to quote you a part of one of his letters. He cites a play by Lamartine about Cromwell—of all people—about Cromwell in exile in East Anglia. But Van Gogh was clearly thinking of himself: "the monotonous horizon, the muddy river, the clouded skies, the meager trees, the infrequent cottages, the rude habits of its inhabitants were such as to make the young man's habits concentrated and gloomy. The soul of a land seems to enter into the soul of a man. Often a lively, ardent and profound faith seems to emanate from a poor and dismal country."

Then he uses this great sentence: "The soul is a mirror before it becomes a home." And a mirror, in fact, became Van Gogh's home in that amazing series of self-portraits that he made, so much in the tradition of that other great Dutch painter, Rembrandt, who influenced him. These were not reflections of vanity, these self-portraits, but a constant effort at self-definition, self-knowledge.

His subject matter was Dutch all the way through. Still lifes, flower pieces, landscapes, portraits, and above all, low life. And again he was right in the heart of a tradition, for within twenty miles of where Van Gogh painted "The Potato Eaters," lived, centuries earlier, the visionary painter, Hieronymus Bosch, who had that striking image in one of his paintings (you may remember) of a musician who was crucified on a harp, an image so similar to one you can see in the museum here in Portland of the weaver who is swallowed up by his loom.

In the same region the great Flemish painter of low life, Breughel, operated; and also Adriaen Brouwer, one of the greatest in the seventeenth century, who also had a thoroughly unhappy life.

But even when Van Gogh was in southern France, finally during the last years of his life, in Provence, he looked for the Dutchness of things there. He painted orchards and bridges, boats and flat broad landscapes there; everything that reminded him of home. This man was thoroughly Dutch all his life. You see, he never left the Netherlands, wherever he went. To paraphrase another angular and recalcitrant man, Senator Wayne Morse, the country left him.

What kind of a person was he? Read the letters and you will find out for yourselves. I never knew him, of course, but the letters are sufficient; few people turned out that many, and they are so honest. I feel like simply stating that he smoked a pipe and leave it at that; but I realize that isn't enough.

What most people don't know about him is that he was physically about as tough as people get, very plucky, very cheerful as a young man. His mother said that, of all her children, she never worried about his health.

Here is a report toward the end of his life. His brother Theo's wife finally met him a few months before he committed suicide; he had spent some months in a mental institution after the ear-lobe-cutting episode and the fight with Gauguin. And she says: "I had expected a sick man, but here was a sturdy, broad-shouldered man with a healthy color, a smile on his face and a very resolute appearance."

Not a sick man at all, he had an amazing resilience, an amazine recuperative power. He was also a man of telling intellectual powers, well read, with a disciplined mind, a philosopher; in fact, a lucid philosopher. I think in the long run he may become better known for his letters even than for his paintings. Here was a man who at the age of 16 knew four languages fluently. They made a great deal of the fact that later he could not learn Latin and Greek. He could have learned those languages; but he didn't see the need for it. He didn't believe you needed them in order to minister to the poor as a clergyman.

Here is a man who was really a genius in the classic meaning of the word, a man who took infinite pains. No man took more pains, literal pains. His work didn't come easily, it didn't just come in an instinctive spurt. He worked for it, and it killed him eventually.

This man was a great realist; his work, like his mind, was never in the clouds, but always in the muddy soil of the Netherlands, believe me. He had few illusions, about himself or about his world.

In one letter to Theo there is this shocking line, in response to Theo's writing about how dreadful a world this is. He writes, "Don't judge God on this world, it's simply a study that didn't come off." He had no self-pity at all. When they told him he shouldn't be suffering so much, he wrote a whole letter to the effect that it hasn't been proven that suffering is bad for man.

He was a passionate man, he was a loving man, he never forgot a person. Often in his letters there is his concern for the schoolmates he knew when he was young, and particularly for his family. He always had this sense of belonging to Noord-Brabant, where he came from—always echoes from the past, always homesickness. A poet recently made a speech in Dutch the title of which was "Rather Homesick than Holland," which describes the same feeling.

His letters are conversational, spontaneous, direct; they are rarely excited and never out of control. There is no trace of any mental unbalance in any of his letters at all, as there isn't in the paintings. These are profound letters.

Now, what was the pattern of this man's life? By and large, it is simple: it is rejection. Here was a warm and affectionate child, a very passionate child, a very interested child, a curious child, who was constantly being rebuffed by his surroundings, because in his day you didn't show emotions, you kept them to yourself. So, of course, he withdrew; so, of course, he became shy; this is natural, this is nothing unusual, and this is not sick.

He bore up very well under the strains. Listen to the forbearance that shows in this letter. He writes to his brother who is home in Nuenen while he is in The Hague. He writes: "I wish we were walking together, or looking in at the weaver's. Now that cannot be, and why not? I don't quite understand it and I think it is going a little too far when you as well as father feel ashamed just to walk with me." Even his beloved brother was ashamed to walk with him because he didn't wear the kind of clothes that a man of his class in Dutch society of that period ought to have worn. He dressed informally, like a peasant or working man.

There is a saying in Dutch, Twaalf ambachten, dertien ongelukken, which means "Twelve trades, thirteen misfortunes." This really applies to Van Gogh. He had a unique series of failures, in all of the things he wanted to do, as a book salesman, preacher, teacher, evangelist, lover. He even failed in committing suicide neatly. He failed particularly in his relations with women, and this was a very serious matter with him, for he was a passionate man.

Now, why did he fail so often? I think he was a man all of one piece; he loved, but did not control his love. He didn't dole it out in easy doses. If he loved, he dumped it all on the loved one. Very few people could stand that, I think. You see, he took everything literally. His thoughts always matched his actions. He was uncompromising.

Yes, he was hard to live with. Any man with a purpose, with an active faith, is hard to live with. Any man with a strong social belief is hard to live with. He was a man whose every act was a moral act, and that is not the kind of person you want around. They are embarrassing; charged men give off shocks like exposed wires. This man was a true protestant, the very embodiment of protest, and the Protestants didn't like that much, naturally.

He finally became an artist, not because he had always wanted to be one, but because every other road to the future had been cut off for him. I think the reason that he turned to art finally was that his brother Theo was already established in the field and could support him and give him supplies. So Van Gogh then began to pour all his dammed-up energy and passion into his art, and he produced a remarkable body of work in ten years. And none of it was done casually; all of it was disciplined.

To do one "Potato Eaters" painting, he would draw fifty portraits of models, and he would do dozens of sketches. He was not a man who impulsively sat down at the canvas in a mad fit and painted these things, although this is the impression that has been given you.

But at what cost did he create them—of self-neglect, of renunciation and privation? I don't think you need elaborate medical or psychological theories about his illnesses. He was strong, he was sane, he was passionate. But not even Vincent van Gogh with his immense strength could stand up to the strains of a constant lack of everything a human organism needs. Love in the first place, and good food, good drinks, and maybe a wife. He was worn down simply by overwork, by cheap food, by cheap liquor, and cheap prostitutes. That's all he could afford; you don't have to get more complicated than that. You don't need to call in Freud at all.

Only once in all of his letters is he bitter; and I want to read you his lament because I think it is significant. In a letter to Theo he said: "A wife you cannot give me, a child you cannot give me, work you cannot give me, money yes. But what good is that to me if I must do without the rest."

His whole life, then was one continuous effort to establish meaningful relationships with people and with events, and he failed. He failed right on through to the end. Now, I am not trying to tell you that he was normal in our sense of the word; he was obviously not an organization man. But no artist is. He wasn't mad, either.

Certainly he had depressions. Who would not have been depressed under his circumstances? He had a mild form of epilepsy finally, and then he collapsed under the agonizing pressures. The miracle is that it didn't happen sooner. I don't know of any of us who could have borne up under this sort of treatment all those years, and turned out the kind of work he did. Just think of the strain that the creation of the work alone must have put on him.

He was ill but not insane. If his art is psychotic art, it doesn't belong in any museum, but up at the medical school, psychiatric division, as a case history. The point is that this magnificent body of work was not produced *because* of illnesses, it was produced in *spite* of them. That is the glory, that is the real achievement; otherwise it would be merely an oddball, beatnik kind of thing.

I believe that in a very human, a very Christian way, Vincent van Gogh was so supremely sane that the very oddity of it would cause people to call him insane. Maybe he was the kind of man that will be a standard for what a human being should be in the future. I think that his very existence was an implied threat to his surroundings.

Here is a man, as I said, whose every action matched his words, whose whole life, to use the bullfighter's phrase, was one long moment of truth. Here is a man who exposed himself completely and utterly to the world, to all the elements both natural and man-made. He was wide open to the universe, a committed man. A man whose ethics became, in effect, his aesthetics.

What is at the heart of Van Gogh's life and work? Theo, his brother, wrote to his mother right after Vincent had committed suicide; there is a line in the letter that says in Dutch: *Het leven woog hem zo zwaar*—"Life weighed so heavy to him, life was such a burden to him." This simple sentence went through my mind and reminded me of another sentence concerning love as a burden.

One of the most tremendous sentences in all literature, it seems to me, is the key to Van Gogh. It's a line by St. Augustine. I am not trying to show off my rusty Latin, but I would like to read you the wonderfully heavy original sentence: *Amor meus, pondus meum; illo feror, quocumque feror*—"My love is my weight; where it goes, there I go."

We don't have to be embarrassed by the use of the word love. What I mean is love in its broadest total human meaning. This man was by love propelled, by love possessed. This kind of love means an acceptance of everything, being wide open to all of life, having a reverence for life.

Notice, for instance, how often Van Gogh painted growing, flowering things. It is not desire, not lust, but love. And no one has made this distinction clearer, to my mind, than the Spanish philosopher, Ortega y Gasset. Allow me to read you some lines by Ortega which so particularly and peculiarly apply to Van Gogh, even though they were not written about him.

> Desire automatically dies when it is fulfilled, it ends with satisfaction. Love, on the other hand, is eternally unsatisfied. Desire has a passive character; when I desire something, what I actually desire is that the object come to me . . . Love . . . is the exact reverse of desire, for love is all activity. Instead of the object coming to me, it is I who go to the object and become part of it.
>
> In the act of love the person goes out of himself . . . Love is a gravitation toward that which is loved . . . In loving we abandon the tranquility and permanence within ourselves, and virtually migrate toward the object. And this constant state of migration is what it is to be in love . . . Love reaches out to the object in a visual expansion . . . Loving is perennial vivification, creation, and intentional preservation of what is loved.

What you see now at the museums is Van Gogh's "intentional preservation" of all he loved, all he reached out for "in visual expansion." In Dutch we have a word which applies to his way of doing things: inleven—to live oneself into something. I think the English word for it is empathy.

Here is a man who was always reaching out for relationships, for life, constantly reaching. He also reached out often for the unreachable, for the sun, for the stars even, as you can see in his last paintings. He reached out for the spirit of a man through painting the old pair of shoes he wore. He imbued everything with his own life, his own emotions. He set his paintings in motion from within by becoming a part of them. He embraced his subject matter.

This is quite different from what a man like Cezanne had in mind. Cezanne painted in Provence at the same time Van Gogh did and but a few miles away. I have nothing against Cezanne; he is a great painter too. To Cezanne, nature was a set of optical impressions the volumes and the shapes of which he set down in a very cool and almost classic manner. Cezanne exploited nature for his own purposes, which is legitimate; Van Gogh embraced, accepted everything around him, and so took painting far beyond the visual arts in the old sense. I think that is what intrigues people; it is surely one reason for the huge crowds he draws. They don't come only to look at the paintings; they are also searching for the man in the paintings, and he is there.

Van Gogh's way of living became his way of painting. It was blunt, direct, uncompromising; the way he put on the paint was the way he would argue, or fight. Every brushstroke speaks his credo of the unity of all life. The preacher-to-be became a painter, but he was still the preacher. Every work of his, every letter of his cries out, "I couldn't care more."

I think that is why he affects us so spectacularly in this age when we are all armored against compassion, in an age when the main slogan is "I could not care less." This man is not an entertainer, he is not a painter of pretty pictures for the people. This man was a spokesman, a prophet. What did he say? It would be very presumptuous of me to tell you what I think he said. You can go to the museum and look for yourselves, and you should. Too many people have been kept from hearing what he said, because the way he said it was so colorful, so overwhelming.

But I do want to tell you the one thing he says to me more than anything else, and the best way I can tell it is to describe a cartoon I saw in the New Yorker a few weeks ago. It showed a Salvation Army Santa Claus, dressed to kill, with his pail and his bell. Next to him on the ground was a Skid Row bum holding out his hat and carrying a sign saying, "Eliminate the middle man." This is what Van Gogh said to all of us—"Eliminate the middle man." Don't put anything between you and reality, between you and experience, between you and other people—no organizations, no ministers, no intermediaries of any kind.

He was a premature existentialist. He believed that all of us are responsible for all our acts. He lived by this belief, and was killed by it. He believed that there are no comfortable barriers behind which we can hide. He never hid behind anything.

Much has been made of his death, and I want to say a few words about it, because there was no contradiction between his death and his life. Ironically enough he was crushed to death between two other Vincents. Two years before he was born his parents had had a child which was called Vincent, and it died. He used to be taken as a child to the graveyard to see the gravestone of this other little Vincent. This made a profound impression on him and convinced him that they really hadn't wanted him, but the earlier Vincent. That was in the beginning of his life. And at the end of it, all he had was his brother. He had cut off all meaningful relationships with practically everyone else. His brother was his only anchor.

And then Theo met a girl. At that point Van Gogh began to have mental trouble, he began to get worried; his last anchor was slipping away. The brother and the girl got married, and they had a child, which they called Vincent. Three weeks before his death, Van Gogh made a sudden visit to Paris, and the record, otherwise so complete, is not very clear on exactly what happened at this meeting with his brother. This was the first time that Vincent and Theo ever had a real argument. The baby had been sick and there apparently wasn't enough money to give him proper medical care.

At this point Vincent must have begun to feel like a completely unnecessary burden to his brother. He went back to Auvers, thought about all of this, as he would. And then, always the realist and feeling anyhow that he had done his work, he simply checked out. That is all there is to his suicide. A man is entitled to his own life, and to his own death. In any case he had done better with his life than most people had with theirs, even though he only lived to the age of 37. You can't blame him for checking out when he wasn't wanted anymore by anyone. His mission was accomplished.

One more point I want to make: he did not die for any of us. There is a tendency to make him into a kind of Protestant saint. Whether Protestants need saints or not, he is not the one to choose. To be a saint would have been against his very grain and intent. A saint is a middle man between us and our responsibilities, and it is the last thing that he would have wanted to be for anyone.

He doesn't need pity, he needs understanding; and I hope these words will make you understand him a little better. The reality of Van Gogh's life is sufficient; it is overbearingly sufficient for purposes of understanding. Maybe he was a Don Quixote, a kind of a fool, but that is far better than being a Hamlet. I believe, in any case, that most progress is made by those who are not afraid to look like fools, because deep inside of them they know they are not fools.

As I said, his beliefs, and his acts were inseparable, all one piece. And so his death was an intrinsic, inevitable, and, to my mind, an enviable part of his life. Arturo Barea, the Spanish critic, writing about the poet and playwright Federico Garcia Lorca, who was murdered by Franco's mercenaries in 1936, wrote this sentence: "It is possible for a man to die so that he kills his own death."

I submit that Vincent van Gogh did exactly that.

THE LIBRARY OF

CONTINUING EDUCATION

THE IMAGE OF LOVE IN FILM*

The following brief quotations give the essence of what I want to say tonight:

> "Better a dish of vegetables with love, than the best of beef stewed with hatred."
> Proverbs 15:17

> "The function of a writer is to call a spade a space. If words are sick, it is up to us to cure them . . . I distrust the incommunicable; it is the source of all violence."
> Sartre, What is Literature?

> "Old images never die; they have to be publicly broken."
> Raymond Williams

Now I could stop here but I won't. The Lovers and I are old friends. I owe it something; we've been through the censorship wars together. Before the film I am going to make a few general remarks about it. Afterwards I want to speculate for a while, impressionistically, about the image of love in film. I selected The Lovers for three reasons:

(1) It projects both the common and the new image of love I am going to discuss; in fact it shows you the metamorphosis from one into the other.

(2) It relates tellingly to the main subjects of this conference: the questions of love in affluent society; and the pleasure versus procreation issue.

(3) It is an excellent film, even if not a great one.

This film was first noticed when it received the Special Jury Prize at the 1958 Venice Film Festival. It was a controversial film from the start, especially in this country. In Portland also it became an issue, as some of you may remember. I know I do. A collision with one's city council on the issue of obscenity isn't an everyday event. I argued in 1960 that this film was not obscene by any reasonable definition. Last June the

---

*Presented at the opening session of Love in a Contemporary Society, a three-day conference at the Portland Continuation Center, February 16-18, 1965.

United States Supreme Court found the film not obscene on constitutional grounds. Allow me one quote from Justice Goldberg's opinion: "I have viewed the film and . . . the love scene deemed objectionable is so fragmentary and fleeting that only a censor's alert would make an audience conscious that something 'questionable' is being portrayed." This is exactly what happened. Whatever may be objected to in this sequence takes place in the mind of the spectator, and not on the screen as all of you will see.

This film must be seen in the perspective of its place and time. It spearheaded what we now call the "New Wave" in French film-making. This was a kind of palace revolution by young graduates of the Paris Film Institute (IDHEC) and young film critics; it resulted in the best of them, in effect, capturing the industry from the old, hidebound, established directors. It represents a needed reaction against a stagnant industry mired down in producing artificial, escapist films that were as out of touch with their audiences as they were with the temper of their times. It established a director's cinema as opposed to a producer's, profit-directed cinema. These young people (Truffaut, Godard, Resnais, Varda, Malle, etc.) proved that a film could be as individual a work of art as a painting or a novel. If they had a slogan, it was the word "demystification."

The Lovers is clearly a young man's film. Louis Malle was 25 when he made it. This is evident in the ironic tone of acute social observation of the first part of the film, and especially in the lyrical, romantic tone of the last part—a sort of Keatsean ode to sexual love, as one critic phrased it.

Malle revealed himself as a superlative craftsman in his first film, using camera and microphone superbly to evoke and suggest appeals to all the human senses, not just to those of sight and sound. This is crucial in the key sequence. Brilliant camera work, the first truly expressive use of the wide screen, dry, concise dialogue, pertinent choice of music, distinguish this film. The disputed sequence is creatively one of the great passages in film history.

This is a film about contemporary human love, about the lack of it, the need for it, and, finally, a reckless reaching for it. It examines a situation of concern to many with sensitivity and sincerity. To be sure, it disturbs. Modern art of any kind tends to do that. In this case it is not at all surprising in view of the nature of the subject matter, which touches the roots of being of a majority of people: sexual love.

Art has, throughout history, examined and depicted sources of contemporary social strain and conflict, inevitably tackling new, previously hidden, subject matter in doing so. Art is now, once again, making sexual love a conscious part of life.

Science daily presents us with new dimensions in the physical world. Why shouldn't art suggest possible new boundaries and new variations in emotional relationships? Isn't one of the age-old functions of art to help us solve our emotional problems? A genuine work of art—as The Lovers is—expresses feelings, as Rader so pithily put it, not in order to arouse similar feelings (pseudo-art does that), but it portrays feelings in order to foster, to transmit understanding, in this case of the dilemma of the main character, the wife.

Here is art which gives us the sense of some facts of contemporary love. Here is a civilized film.*

Examining my recollections of the hundreds of films I have seen, I concluded that the image of love is rare in film, that is, the image of an affectionate, intimate relationship on a voluntary and equal basis between a man and a woman. The word "love" is showered on us from the soundtracks, but what we see is another matter. Basically, love is presented as a means toward something else, rarely as an end in itself. There are exceptions to this generalization, but I will be surprised if you can bring up many. As a matter of cold fact, the prevalent image on our screens is not one of love at all, of any kind, but one of hatred. Making love on screen is frowned upon, but you can make all the hatred you want with impunity. Sadism has become a major spectator sport.

Consider the film Goldfinger, the champion box office attraction on the screen, the most lucrative non-roadshow movie of all time, with its 57 varieties of killing people, shown in scientific detail: decapitation with a metal derby hat, skin-asphyxiation through gold paint, electrocution by bank vault, and so on *ad nauseam*. The chief ingredients are two kinds of familiar objects: girls and guns. The main female character is named Pussy Galore. That bit of information is, I feel, very relevant to the subject of this conference.

---

*At this point, the author showed the film to the Conference.

Bogus religious films like Ben Hur, with their gratuitous blood and gore in glorious Technicolor, have done much to sanctify the practice of making human suffering a form of mass entertainment, an approved way of cashing in on Christ. It isn't really surprising that the Legion of Decency lists The Lovers as morally contemptible but finds Goldfinger morally unobjectionable for adults. Tenderness is condemned; brutality gets the nod. The events connected with the end of life are lovingly lingered upon, while the events of the beginning of life are evaded, distorted, or made laughable. On the evidence it would seem that the censors consistently vote for death and against life, against love. And so do most filmmakers.

Let us look at the common image of love on screen. Take the American film The Facts of Life, starring Lucille Ball and Bob Hope, made in 1960. It deals with a situation quite similar to that of The Lovers: two unhappily married people (not to each other) in Pasadena, have a kind of sanitized affair, meeting furtively, kissing chastely. They finally decide to run away for a weekend in Monterey. Up to this point the film is rather touching. But now that the possibility (inevitability) of actual physical lovemaking enters, you realize why two comics (Ball and Hope) were cast in the leads. The whole, fairly believable, situation disintegrates now into slapstick comedy; the entire Monterey peninsula conspires to keep them from touching; and once more we get that staple Hollywood product: a case of unconsummated adultery. They return to Pasadena, where their absence has gone undetected, and find that the dull, unaffectionate (if that is the word) husband and the nagging humdrum wife have miraculously changed character. End of the film, and par for the course.

The standard Hollywood approach is one of talk and posturing about sex; nobody actually does anything about it. All sorts of sexual goings-on are vividly suggested (and they are good at that), but it invariably turns out that nobody was unfaithful, promiscuous, or whatever. It's always a misunderstanding. Nothing happened, nothing at all. The image suggests that sexual love is an abnormal outgrowth of the continuum of love, and not a part of it—something like smoking. It's not good for you, but you can't help yourself. The audience gets a sort of respectable striptease, excitation without release; sex becomes a spectator sport. Hollywood knew all about brinkmanship before the word ever occurred to John Foster Dulles. Real conflicts are set up, but they are rarely honestly resolved, and so we get a false, partial, distorted image of love.

You can all check up on this yourselves soon when a new film comes to town called The Young Lovers; it ostensibly deals with premarital sex. The New York Times called it "curiously evasive of its focal problem," and ending on "a fadeout best described as blandly serene." It features a peppery, lovely girl who defends her virtue with true virtuosity. At one point when she has virtually surrendered it to her boyfriend, she utters what seem to me the classic words: "No, dear," she says, "why kill our sweet frustration?" An improvement over "Down, Fido, Down!" in any case.

Married love is seldom a subject for film, except as comedy or as horror film. One wonders why. The highly popular Doris Day domestic comedies are typical and revealing. In them she blatantly advertises a sexuality she clearly isn't selling, constantly provoking the male characters. Of course, her virtue is forever in danger—being a curious blend of exhibitionism and self-restraint. Will she or won't she? That's what draws the crowds. Of course, she won't, but by then the picture is over, and Miss Day is on her way to collect another box office award. Here we are coming close to the most common image of love on screen; the image of B-girl love: all promise and no delivery. Or related to that, the image of love as payment for value received (a wedding ring, an enemy secret), or love as emotional blackmail.

It's only the "bad women" in movies who are allowed to show any overt sexual desire, and they almost always come to a bad end, the proper punishment for doing something about sex in the movies. So Hollywood's main contribution to audio-visual sex education has been squads of the unlikeliest fallen women in history trooping across our broad screens.

Love and careers for women don't mix in the movies. The career woman in film (think of Rosalind Russell, Katherine Hepburn, or Lauren Bacall) is portrayed as mannish and aggressive, generally a nuisance; but in the end their independence deserts them, they give in to their husbands or fiances, abandon their work, become dutiful wives, excellent cooks, and presumably fertile mothers. Procreation wins over creation every time.

The unmarried woman on screen has nothing to do with love at all.

She either pines away as a dull unattractive spinster, or she is presented as an overripe, unprincipled threat to the good woman. On the other hand, the unmarried male, the bachelor, is glorified. Go see those recent heroic poems to bachelorhood, How To Murder Your Wife and Kiss Me, Stupid. You can bet Hugh Hefner will never start a magazine called Playgirl.

Now we come to the films about women as bodies, about sex as a medium of exchange, a commodity. This is Jane Russell country, or Jayne Mansfield or Kim Novak, or Marilyn Monroe country. There's gold in those hills! This is not the place to deal with the American breast fixation which led to Hollywood's "mammary madness," to use Murray Schumach's pungent phrase. But the image of love in these films is crystal clear. It's the image a sultan has, I suppose, or a child—the woman as slave, the woman as doll. This treatment of woman as object plays up to the supposed desire of every man to have an accessible, acquiescent girl, who comes and goes on demand and never raises a fuss. The woman as pin-up, as aid to masturbation, is now institutionalized by Hugh Hefner's Playboy magazine, which is aptly named: it supplies dolls, cut-outs for playboys. What Nelson Algren wrote about Playboy applies equally to this type of film in which women carry their breasts as if they were transporting the Holy Grail: "Those bosomy girls are not blooming in order to gain a lover's caress, but rather to serve as an object of temptation that righteous man will resist . . . The force behind Hefner's image of a woman is one of contempt born of desperate fear. What he is selling is Cotton Mather puritanism in a bunny outfit."

This remark of Algren's finally made clear to me something that had long baffled me, namely why Jane Russell, the grandmother of the breast cult, keeps evangelizing in churches and going on gospel singing tours. Her performances in The Outlaw and similar epics, were obviously simply in line of duty, soul-saving duty. She makes men feel righteous. I can see that now.

The essential corruptness of the prevalent image of love and sex in film is blindingly embodied (the perfect word, for once) in the tragedy of Marilyn Monroe, in the discrepancy between her image and her reality, in the almost surgical separation of love and sex, and in the resultant, eventually unbearable, tensions between the public and the private Marilyn which tore her apart. Let the very titles of her films stand as an indictment of the most common American image of love. Here they are: Let's Make Love, Love Nest, We're Not Married, The Prince and the Showgirl, Don't Bother To Knock, Gentlemen Prefer Blondes, How to Marry a Millionaire, Some Like it Hot, The Seven Year Itch, The Misfits. William Butler Yeats wrote her epitaph years ago: "We've fed the heart on fantasies. The heart's grown brutal on the fare."

You are aware by now that I have talked primarily about the image of woman in films, and not about the image of love. This is not accidental. It's the very point I wish to make. We cannot talk meaningfully about the image of democracy in this country without coming to grips with the image of the Negro. By the same token we cannot consider the image of love without dealing with its essential aspect, the image of woman.

The Negro in film was, until quite recently, represented usually, as, say, a docile Uncle Tom, a devoted servant, a happy slave, a sexual superman, a razor-wielding delinquent, a natural-born cook, a perfect entertainer . . . Fill in your own stereotype. The Negro image was many-faceted, but always lacking was the facet showing the Negro as a person in his own right, as an autonomous individual. All these stereotyped images had one thing in common: they constituted a justification of white attitudes toward Negroes by assigning them characteristics which "proved" them inferior. The images were deliberately distorted as an essential part of a massive psychological warfare effort—partly subconscious, no doubt—to aid those with a vested interest in Negro inferiority. These false images were created by whites.

The prevalent image of women (and so of love) on screen is equally distorted, as we have seen, and for the same reasons I believe. (In fact the images are often similar: the woman as servant, as cook, as entertainer, as sexual object, etc.) Women, like Negroes, are second-class citizens in our society, and the images of them on screen are created largely to justify male superiority. These images are made by men, although like any other oppressed group, women often see themselves as inferior and cooperate in helping along the distortion (awareness of this, I believe, had a lot to do with Marilyn Monroe's suicide).

Social science teaches us that stereotypes are caused by anxieties, by threats to one's status which freeze one's perceptions. We know also that stereotyping sharply reduces the capacity to solve problems by causing what psychiatrists call "denial reactions," that is a denial of the very existence of the threat. Our capacity to solve problems in human relations, in marriage, etc., has been severely hampered, I think, by the pervasive stereotypes of women on our screens. Alternatives, new truer images are threatening, as all the furor about The Lovers indicated. What is the basic threat from which the stereotypes are supposed to protect us? Basically I think it is the fear of the 50-50 proposition, the fear of a man-woman relationship that is in fact an alliance of equals.

David Riesman has pointed to one significant aspect of this threat: the greater equality of women in sexual relations allows them to take the initiative and to insist on sexual pleasure, which in turn has made women critical consumers of male performance, something men don't relish, according to Riesman.

The claim to sex equality has in recent years penetrated the field of film, and its impact is beginning to create a new, less distorted image of women. The Lovers is a pioneering example. That is why I am running it at the very beginning of this conference on love. I believe that what was essentially objected to in this film was not the adultery *per se* or the lovemaking *per se*, but the very character of the woman as it changed in this film. The censors were not disgusted by it as they claimed (I watched a group of them looking at this film and sniggeringly enjoying it), but they must have felt personally threatened by it. Remember Algren's remark about contempt born of desperate fear? The wife in The Lovers breaks out of her doll house with a vengeance that is as disturbing to many men as a racially-integrated film is to segregationists. By her act—and it *had* to be shown—the wife denies the reactionary but still prevalent notion that woman is essentially passive and masochistic. She explores sexual pleasure for its own sake and finds it good.

The wife, in the first part of the film, presents a perfect example of what Olive Schreiner called, more than half a century ago, "the parasitism of the human female," caused by affluence, absence of meaningful work, servants caring for the children, and similar factors conducive to personality disintegration. Miss Schreiner called these women "the most deadly microbe which can make its appearance on the surface of any social organism." When one considers the common images of women on screen, it is striking how many of them deal with female parasites of one kind or another. The wife in The Lovers stops being a parasite by kicking the double standard publicly in the teeth. The contrast between the archaeologist and the other two men triggers the rebellion. What we are witnessing on screen is a small revolution (like Rosa Parks refusing to sit in the back of the bus in Montgomery, Alabama), but it is significant because it publicly breaks an old discredited image.

What is this new image of woman? It's woman becoming protagonist; it's woman taking charge of her own destiny, of her own body, asserting her personal autonomy; it's woman ceasing to be man's property, man's toy, man's invention, man's fantasy; it's woman becoming creative in her own person rather than merely procreative; it's woman enjoying herself sexually without apology. It's the female as bona fide modern hero in film, as A. J. Alexander points out in the only, but excellent, article on this subject I managed to find. This new image of woman asserts the impending death, finally, of the tenacious Victorian image of love and especially of the attitude expressed by Queen Victoria herself when she advised a daughter about to go off on her honeymoon: "Just lay on your back and think of England."

The new woman in film exhibits a will, and an identity of her own. Not just in European films. We can see it in the kind of woman portrayed by Shirley MacLaine, or by Julie Andrews in The Americanization of Emily. A significant change in American films is the fact that these women can now break conventional moral codes without having to suffer the cliché consequences.

The best film director of them all, Michelangelo Antonioni, deals only with these new women in his films. All his protagonists are women aspiring to love who are defeated by weak men and an uncaring society. There is a striking similarity in theme, and treatment between The Lovers, and the Polish film, Knife in the Water, which deserves separate treatment. Room at the Top and Hiroshima, Mon Amour are other well-known examples of the new image in the making. One thing it suggests is what social scientists have stated for quite a while, namely that marriage may well have to compete on an equal basis with new types of emotional relationships in the future. These films imply that marriage is beginning to lose its monopoly status under the impact of emancipation, the pill, and the population crisis.

For clarity's sake let me delineate briefly the quartet of characters in The Lovers, in the light of what I've said:

THE HUSBAND: a moneymaking machine, cold, cunning, self-righteous, spiteful. He practices the double standard: has affair in office, and says, as he makes his wife invite her lover: "I resent competition. I cannot endure defeat." To him his wife does not exist as a person, but as a piece of furniture that comes with the house.

THE LOVER: a parasite, too—all package, no content, pretentious, having no clear identity. He is too narcissistic to notice the wife—his mistress—as a person.

THE ARCHAEOLOGIST: totally unpretentious, self-possessed, loyal (to old teacher), has fidelity to people, not ambitious. Not devious, does not play games. Non-coercive. When the wife tells him he is too complicated for her, his answer is revealing: "But I am not an unkind person," he says. Indeed, he is the only one who is kind, tender, and gentle.

THE WIFE: a provincial (standard character in French literature), ill at least with phony sophistication, still having a taste for the genuine and recognizing it in the archaeologist. There's a line in Faulkner about a choice between grief or nothing. This is her choice, and she chooses grief. Last line: "She was afraid, but she regretted nothing." In the old image she would not need to be afraid, and she would have regretted everything.

A final word about the disputed sequence: what applies to the new image of love generally, also applies to the image of human bodies. In the old image bodies are objects for voyeurism. In The Lovers I believe the director managed to keep from dehumanizing the human body by the way the scenes were shot. The camera, the lighting, make an indirect appeal to our sense of touch—a closeup sense, which demands involvement—and they play down the sense of sight which gives power of detachment, of spectatorship. Other senses are involved, too. The treatment is sensual, not sexual. This is felt art, and only secondarily seen art. A great achievement.

The bodies in this sequence, in a very real sense, control their own volition, and are, to that degree, emancipated—which means according to my dictionary "free from restraint of any kind, free from the power of another." Why preach emancipation, if we are not prepared to practice it, at least to face it? We had better learn to live with, I think, and to learn from this emerging new image of love. The point now is, however: What do you think?

SEARCHING FOR PORTLAND[*]

This introduction to "Urban Mosaic" is the first session of what we expect will be a regular event Wednesday nights at 9:30. Note that I said "event," not program. Let's be clear at the start. This will not be a series with a set format, but rather an attempt to come to meaningful grips with a specific subject in any way that seems suitable. The emphasis will always be on the subject, if necessary, at the expense of niceties in format. I look at "Urban Mosaic" as a process, not a series of separate entities.

The subject will be quite familiar to you, and yet, ironically, very unfamiliar at the same time, for we will discuss our own surroundings, in this case the Portland metropolitan area in all its aspects. We will try to scrutinize the interactions between our immediate environment and all of us—the people living in it.

This area of study is known in my circles, in academic circles nowadays, as urban studies. I would rather paraphrase Thomas Wolfe and say: let's look homeward together, let's consider how we live, here and now, and why. But before going into my subject let me try to put the discussion into perspective.

Most of us know more about South Vietnam and Selma, Alabama, than we know of, say, Portland's Albina district, or urban renewal here, or the pollution of the Willamette River. And, of course, we should know about those faraway places where crucial events affecting our future occur. But there isn't really much we can do about them. There is a great deal more that can, concretely and personally, be done about what is around us, on our very doorsteps, under our noses, if only we would pay attention to it. We could all do with a dose of social nearsightedness.

Each of us has his own Portland. It's time we got acquainted with the other Portlands that border our own: the Negro's Portland and the waterfront Portland, the old people's Portland and the architect's Portland, the realtor's Portland, the Highway Commission's Portland, and all the other Portlands. I would like this publicly-owned television channel every week at this time to become the meeting place of those different Portlands, which will shape the Portland of our future.

---

[*] Introductory remarks explaining a new educational television program, Urban Mosaic, presented on KOAP-TV and KOAC-TV, Portland, Oregon, March 31, 1965.

By its very nature, this will be a local discussion. But it is elementary that whatever affects Portland affects Oregon as a state, and other states have their own Portlands as well. We will concentrate on the Portland area, but eventually I hope we can undertake to deal with the Willamette Valley or statewide problems.

We will have our hands full just taking a hard look at Portland, trying to see it for what it is and considering what it can, and maybe ought to be. Our great challenge is that before you can make people care, you must first make them aware.

How, then will I go about this? The two parts of the title indicate my intention—"Urban Mosaic." A mosaic is a design formed by various pieces of different colors and shapes and substances. The pieces that will form my mosaic, will be discussions, confrontations, filmed reports, on the spot interviews, any form of presentation that fits. Some years ago I did a television program called "Speaking for Myself." Originally I wanted to call this program "Speaking for Ourselves." I didn't, but the idea is still very much there. I expect people to speak their minds, while having a willingness to be corrected, to be proven wrong. The second part of the title, "Searching for Portland," has two meanings for me. Here we will search for the different Portlands I mentioned, explore Portland as if it were unknown territory, examine it in depth.

In addition, I will search for Portland in another way; I will do research for the benefit of Portland by trying to find films, pictures, other evidence from elsewhere that has a bearing on our local urban situation from which we can learn something.

I believe no subject is too complex to be presented to those affected by it. There are no easy answers. I assume you will work along, think along with skepticism and that you will study the subjects further on your own. And, you have a standing invitation to join me here on the air. The very regularity of "Urban Mosaic" allows us to add additional information, present opposing points of view while the subject is still fresh in mind.

I like living in Portland better than anywhere else in the country. It suits me. I feel more at home here than I've ever felt anywhere else, except for my Frisian hometown. When I moved to Portland from Los Angeles in 1957, it seemed as if after 19 years of quarantine in Southern California, I had finally been allowed to enter the United States. Portland is fine for me, but it isn't for many others. It is not a beautiful city, but it can be. It already possesses one of the most beautiful settings of a city anywhere. I aspire to a Portland that matches the grandeur and health of its natural surroundings. Not just a physically well planned metropolis, but a socially just and healthy one, truly livable for all its inhabitants.

It is true that I am not an expert, but I do possess one major qualification: I care. I am involved in this city. This gives me the edge on a number of experts who are so preoccupied with their own disciplines that they often fail to see relations with other problems, or perceive the human implications. Not being too close to any of the urban trees, I hope to be able to keep my eyes on the total urban forest (at least it is not yet a jungle here).

There's a saying back in my province of Friesland: Know what you say; say what you know—sensible advice for a program of this kind. Let there be controversy here, but never for its own sake. Let there be constant confrontation of facts and ideas, the process Wigmore called the engine of truth. My favorite quotation from Edmund Burke reads:

> He that wrestles with us strengthens our nerves and sharpens our skill. Our antagonist is our helper. This amicable conflict with difficulty obliges us to an intimate acquaintance with our object and compels us to consider it in all its relations. It will not suffer us to be superficial.

One major problem of democracy in a mass society such as ours is the tendency for more and more people to become mere consumers of other people's opinions, and for fewer and fewer people to voice opinions of their own. This station wants to do its bit to reverse that appalling trend locally. The enemy is apathy. The freeway controversy in Portland has shown beyond all doubt that when citizens are personally affected, there is a spontaneous and widespread upsurge of public opinion.

In the final analysis, all a city really is, is people: you and I who happen to be living here, who are responsible for each other, who are responsible for our surroundings. From this personal sense of responsibility I have no intention of being the neutral moderator, the host of an urban variety show. If I have to be called anything, call me the hub of it. A hub after all turns and moves and is rather intimately involved in the wheel. Therefore, I reserve the right to speak up myself on occasion, deliver a secular sermon, a personal editorial, as I will do now.

GOOFING AND PLANNING*

I want to talk tonight out of my own experience about a matter which I think is central to the urban condition, and that is the question of planning and its very opposite, known as goofing. Let me assure you at the start that my qualifications in goofing are impeccable: I am a graduate goofer. My planning education, like that of most of us, leaves much to be desired. The best way I can describe my position in relation to planning is to cite to you the way the United States is designated in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. The United States is officially called "a fully participating observer." That's what I am: a fully participating observer in the urban wars.

The remarks that I am about to make were provoked by a long stay in 1963 in my land of birth, the Netherlands. I have been in this country for twenty-seven years, which is longer than half the population of this country has been in it. I came here when I was 19, but I have stayed in touch with my home country because I like it. My relatives are still there, I read about it, and I go there whenever I can. So now I have the advantage of being able to see each of my two countries from the perspective of the other, and this is what I propose to do.

For clarity's sake, let's start with the dictionary. Planning is defined as "a formulated method of thinking out acts and purposes beforehand." This is useful because the emphasis clearly is on formulation, on the "beforehand," and on the end, on the purpose. There can't be any planning without purpose. A basic factor in successful planning is the popular attitude toward it, and I thought we would start out by comparing the Netherlands and this country in this regard.

In the Netherlands planning is, by and large, taken for granted: by and large here it is not. The Netherlanders are convinced of the benefits of it, though they are quite aware that not all planning is good, that mistakes are made, that many plans are inadequate. And they criticize accordingly, but as a people they find the notion of planning inherently good, even though they are a nation of true believing individualists. This attitude did not come about because the Dutch are a better people or a more sensible people or a more virtuous people than the Americans. It is no particular credit to them, for actually it was forced upon them, forced upon them by history, or rather by geography. It was forced upon them by the fact that most of the country is below sea level, and for about a thousand years now people in the Netherlands, in order to have a country at all, have had to reclaim it from the sea.

---

*Transcript of another talk in the television series, Urban Mosaic, presented on KOAP-TV and KOAC-TV, March 31, 1965.

This process is beyond the resources of individuals; they have to do this together. The government most often has had to do it, pay for it, and organize it. So land speculation, a very crucial social matter, became impossible under these circumstances. Close cooperation and planning have been a necessity in the Netherlands since the late Middle Ages.

Amsterdam, a city divided by fifty canals into seventy islands—more than Venice—is the first city, I think, that had a comprehensive city plan. And it is no accident, that, worldwide, much of the theory underlying contemporary community-planning is based on the Dutch movement fifty years ago. The movement, called De Stijl, developed the notion of the integration of technology and art, or, to put it another way, integration of intellect and emotion. It isn't surprising that when Rotterdam had to be rebuilt, vigorous controls were used and accepted by probably the most hardheaded businessmen in the world, the Rotterdam businessmen. They were ready for drastic measures, and they accepted a rare thing: complete expropriation of the downtown area. And they are happy about it now. Of course, a more recent factor that has made planning an absolute necessity in the Netherlands is population pressure; nearly thirteen million people live in an area one-eighth the size of Oregon; it is the most densely populated country in the world.

On the other hand, the popular American attitude toward planning is quite different. It is characterized by public apathy, or worse, often by public prejudice. The best word to apply to American attitudes toward planning is "ambivalent." Our dilemma here is understandable: we suspect controls—and I think it is proper that we should suspect controls—but at the same time, we fear anything that is out of control. The common distrust of planning is expressed by the words that are often applied to if: "totalitarian," "socialistic," "bureaucratic."

Public planning, it is said, conflicts with free enterprise. Almost any week in our national publications you see ads by large corporations that bear out this theme. Now the ironic thing is that internal planning is not just accepted, but is required by free enterprise, by large corporations. Corporations of any kind simply could not exist without the most thorough all-embracing planning, forecasting, and controlling. It is essential to them. As an example, take Robert McNamara, our Secretary of Defense, who is famous for his skill in planning, in scientifically-based foresight. He acquired his reputation while completely reorganizing the giant Ford Motor Company with the help of a group of people now known as the "whiz kids"; they were basically all planners, though not my favorite variety.

Nothing, in sober fact, is more controlled than General Motors or General Foods or General Electric or General Dynamics or General Anything except the general good. And that, I suspect, is one of the main reasons why the private sector of our economy is in so much better shape than the public sector. General Motors' economy is more controlled than communist Poland's. They already produce more than one-third of the gross national product of Poland, and they are catching up. General Motors produces more than the gross national product of the entire country of the Netherlands.

There is precious little free enterprise within free enterprise; an entire literature devoted to this fact, about organization men, testifies to the truth of that allegation. Corporations plan for us, and they plan well for us, and often for our benefit; but we are not encouraged to plan for ourselves, and our representatives in Congress and the Senate don't seem to believe much in planning either.

This becomes strikingly clear when you compare the magnificent General Motors Research Center designed by Saarinen—great contemporary architecture—with that new monstrosity on Capitol Hill, the Rayburn House Office Building, the world's most expensive, most garish, and most inefficient building which cost over one hundred million dollars of our money. It was designed, if that is the word, by a non-architect, a former Congressman who, touchingly, put a kitchen in each of the suites of senior Congressmen, but neglected the running water, in a classic bit of

Freudian planning. It's only tax money. Conclusion: what is good for General Motors is too good for the rest of us.

This contradictory American attitude toward planning did not develop accidentally either, nor can the blame or credit for it be placed on the shoulders of lobbyists. I believe that it is a natural outgrowth of elements of our American character and of our unique history as a nation. And these historic roots need to be examined if we want to do something about changing this attitude.

Allow me to talk about this in terms of my own field, which is film. One of the great contributions that this country has made to the art of film is the chase. Few action pictures are without a chase, and I have a hunch that any night on television you can catch, if you want to, three or four chases. It's no wonder that D. W. Griffith, who developed this device, did so in this country, because the chase is literally, verbally, part of our heritage. It's in our Declaration of Independence; one of our inalienable rights is the pursuit of happiness. Pursuit! No other constitution anywhere in the world grants this right. In this country we run for office; in England you stand for office.

As the geographical location forced certain developments upon the Netherlands, so the very geography of the United States inevitably made us a nation on the move, a chasing nation, a hurrying nation and a mobile nation. It has made us what we are, for better and for worse.

Essential for a chase, in the movies, is the last-minute rescue, by the Marines, or whoever else the good guys are. (In the first classic chase, in Griffith's The Birth of a Nation, the last-minute rescue was performed, of all people, by the white-hooded Ku Klux Klan!) As a nation I think we hold a tacit belief in the last-minute rescue. Something will pull us through. And our situation and our resources in the past usually have. Aren't we God's Own Country? Don't our coins say "In God We Trust"? If you really believe that—if you really believe that you ought to trust in God completely, you don't plan much. It leads to the attitude of a number of elderly devout Christians I know in my home town who never took out insurance of any kind, believing, in effect, that insurance is a vote of non-confidence in God, a point hard to argue with, given their sublime faith.

John Foster Dulles canonized this belief in the last-minute rescue by enunciating his policies of "brinkmanship," the results of which can be observed any day around Saigon.

My point is that this long standing and still prevalent resistance to planning is rooted, in large part, in an idyllic view of our past, in the faith that, never mind what happens, we can start all over again, that there are always more open frontiers, that waste isn't really serious, because you can always dig up some more of this or find some more of that or cut some more trees, and so on, and that all will end well . . . But will it? Are happy endings our birthright, off as well as on television?

It is a very likeable notion and, as I said, it did make us what we are today. I suppose that in a sense we could afford all this waste, this immense and casual squandering of human and material resources. But I don't think it holds true anymore. History has finally caught up with us. Events unimagined a few years ago have caught us woefully unprepared: unemployment, forty-million poor, automation, the struggle for civil rights, the population explosion, the rise of the new nations, add your own crisis. Even our military power is no solution. A. J. Liebling, the late New Yorker writer, once wrote that men are not free if they cannot see where they are going, even if they have guns to help them get there. And we have the guns, but where are we going? What are our plans? What are our goals specifically to deal with these new situations? Do we have to remain victims of our own complacent fantasies?

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present . . . We must disenthrall ourselves." Excellent advice for today, but you probably know who gave it—Abraham Lincoln in 1862. In the same message to Congress he said: "The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new—so we must think anew . . . Fellow citizens we cannot escape history. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth." That paragraph is as relevant in the urban civil war in which we find ourselves now as it was in the national civil war a century ago.

Democracy does not, in fact, cannot grow like Topsy. It needs careful attention; it needs nurturing; it needs planning. Democracy is not an accomplished fact that was handed to us, that we inherited, ready-made, and in full-operating order. Democracy is an always unfinished business that must be constantly created and recreated and the only sensible way to defend democracy is to practice it. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, of democracy, we say on patriotic occasions. Planning is a form of vigilance. One good way to define planning and to show the need for it, is to consider its opposite: lack of planning, popularly known as goofing. Goofing is basically lack of vigilance, lack of foresight. The word "goofing" has an interesting history. Before the Second World War, I think it was looked at more or less as having primarily funny connotations. Disney had a character called Goofy. Wodehouse in England used the word. Now I think the connotations of goofing have become essentially tragic.

First a definition: to me a goof is a preventable stupidity. It implies lack of attention, of foresight, not working at capacity, not seeing what is right in front of you, failing to draw obvious conclusions. Goofing relates to planning as anaesthetics relates to aesthetics, or as numbness relates to awareness, or evasion to facing facts. I think we must distinguish goofing from taking a calculated risk. When you take a calculated risk there is an element of awareness, very much an element of awareness, and often you are defeated by chance which is always present. That is one distinction. Another distinction: you must always distinguish goofing from deliberate malice. The sheriff of Selma in "occupied" Alabama was not goofing. Neither is goofing caused by palpable incapacity or authentic inadequacy. Stupid ill-trained people make errors. Intelligent well-trained people, like you and me, we goof.

Let me try to define goofing by some examples. I think one could write the history of almost anything—from the history of the world to the history of cheese-making in Tillamook County, based on the theme of goofing. I think you can make a very good case for the proposition that we won World War II simply because Hitler providentially out-goofed us. The notion running through every event of goofing, and please keep this in mind as I go on talking, is this: the unimagined confronted by the unprepared, a trenchant formula I read somewhere.

Winston Churchill comes to mind. Among all the accomplishments this great man had is one that isn't talked about much: he was a connoisseur of goofing, both as a consumer and as a producer. Think of the battles of Gallipoli or Jutland in World War I, or think of the cities of Singapore and Dresden in World War II. Winston Churchill was intimately involved in all these four cases. In two of them as a victim and in two as a culprit. After the battle of Jutland in the First World War, and all those missed opportunities, Churchill, who was First Lord of the Admiralty then, criticized his own admirals for "theorizing from the map, remote from the realities." Twenty-five years later, now prime minister, helplessly watching the fall of Singapore, he found himself on the other side, having committed this very sin of theorizing remote from the realities. He had not known that the so-called impregnable fortress of Singapore in plain fact was no fortress at all. He had blundered, in the words that Tennyson applied to the Charge of the Light Brigade. He had goofed, and in great anguish he wrote his Chiefs of Staff: "I ought to have known; my advisors ought to have known; and I ought to have been told; and I ought to have asked." Sorensen quotes President Kennedy about the Bay of Pigs disaster: "All my life I've known better than to depend on the experts. How could I have been so stupid to let them go ahead?"

Here are the keys: I ought to have known; I ought to have asked. None of us is questioning, skeptical enough; we accept too much on faith from those whom we have ourselves appointed or elected to lead and guide us, and from those—and there are many more of those—who have kindly appointed themselves to tell us what we ought to do. These people often have great skill, but not very much wisdom, on the evidence.

You don't have to look to wars for examples of goofing, although wars are excellent breeding grounds for them, by their very nature. Look at the city of Portland: since 1963 we have had an eloquent memorial to goofing right smack in the heart of our city: the Marquam Bridge, the bridge to nowhere. I understand they are finally going to connect it to the other side. If not, they can always turn it into an amusement pier. Another bridge, the John Day Bridge, presents a somewhat more lethal example of goofing. In this collapsed new bridge you find a perfect case of the unimagined confronted by the unprepared. Nationally, there was in the news recently, the horrifying example of the totally unnecessary sinking of the submarine Thresher with 129 lives. But, by the same token, is the daily slaughter on our highways necessary? Isn't our national fixation on the automobile as the major means of transportation a blunder? Isn't our uncritical acceptance of the car and all that comes with it, such as the strangling of downtown areas by traffic, potentially a greater tragedy in terms of human lives than the uncritical acceptance of the fact that Singapore was a fortress which it turned out not to be? Aren't our very sick cities truly preventable stupidities? Haven't we had enough facile solutions for mere symptoms fobbed off on us?

Now let me add here, that they goof brilliantly in the Netherlands too. Their major goof, of course, is the fact that in the face of the immense population pressure they don't do much toward population planning, even though modern birth control started there; so they have to do a great deal more planning in other areas than would be otherwise necessary. Or, remember the brutal Dutch attempt to reconquer their former colonies in 1945 and 1946. Immediately after their own homeland had been liberated from the German invader, they started to behave themselves in Indonesia like invaders, and in the process lost all the good will of its peoples. They lost a great deal more, unlike the British, who accepted the inevitable in India. Or take the floods in the Netherlands in 1953, another great example of a goof, with about 2,000 dead, immense suffering, vast damages, some still not repaired. This was due in large part to the neglect of the dikes. The dikes had been neglected because they had used the money for an army to fight a new enemy from the East: Russia. But it was the old enemy from the West, the sea, that hit them mercilessly that February. Who was it that said: "It's worse than a crime, it's a blunder"?

They goof all right in the Netherlands but they plan too, and with a vengeance. The example of planning in the Netherlands satisfies me that an intensive yet flexible kind of planning is not only compatible with democracy but tends in many ways to foster it, to aid the democratic process. In the Netherlands they practice coordinated, integrated, comprehensive planning. They do not separate physical planning from social planning, or educational planning from public housing, or to get more down to earth, they even relate the size of living room windows in public housing projects to historically or practically conditioned styles of living. I will give you some other examples later.

They seem to realize that to have community planners is not enough, that what is needed are communities of planners; and that means groups of planners from all related disciplines, and not just architects and engineers, but sociologists, physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, public opinion experts, artists, etc. Such groups often create entire villages and towns in areas recently reclaimed; they create entire suburbs. Of course they create small projects as well.

Virtually an entire new province, built from sea bottom mud, now exists where I used to go sailing as a child. An entire new landscape, an entire new environment has been created, and this was done by the state, paid for by the state, and guided by the state. The state is accepted as the supreme planning authority, to be sure, but it is not an arbitrary authority; the very many-faceted nature of the bodies of planning experts that I have just talked about prevents arbitrary authority. Out of necessity, things have to be predetermined. It is inevitable in a country like the Netherlands. You cannot have unrestricted immigration into the new areas. The population density simply won't allow for it. But with careful research, and with constant consultation with those affected by the planning, the location, the size, the kind of everything is planned, from entire cities of 100,000 people to small sheds.

Within the over-all plans being used there is much leeway for subsidiary planning bodies. This prevents dull uniformity, as they keep adjusting to new knowledge. Three reclaimed areas have been finished since 1928. The style, the structure of the farms in each area is quite different, because they had learned from the experience of the project before. Let me give you another example of this. In the area that was finished second, they built a marvelous large community center. The best art, the best design was used; it's a very effective building for many purposes. But they discovered that many people who ought to have gone did not go there. They were too impressed by it; they suffered from what the Dutch call "drempelvrees," that means: fear of going across the threshold. So in the newest area that is being worked on now, the planning of the community center has been kept as simple as possible. It will be one that will not intimidate people by its very design, however beautiful, but it will be inviting to all—they hope.

It isn't only in relation to the new areas that this sort of planning goes on. Another example demonstrates how they check and how they consult. The Netherlands have a large number of older people, as they have the highest longevity rate in the world; and they look after their older people magnificently. The major building complex in many Dutch towns is the one for old people; and they are beautiful. But, in a number of towns they have checked with these older people and they have found, that even though they are happy where they are, they would like something else. For example, they would have liked to stay in their own familiar section of town. So in one town now, they are doing something about that. Rather than build separate projects on the edge of town, they are building eight or ten small bungalows in each section of town so the older people needn't leave their own old neighborhoods. Another thing they have found is that while older people preferred a small manageable place, they needed one large room; the Dutch often have large pieces of furniture, things they have kept, and want to keep. So these new bungalows are rather small, but there is a large living room in each one. Other matters are considered: all bathtubs in the homes for older people are sunken; it makes them easier for older people to use. This is the sort of responsive and responsible planning I favor.

From these examples you can see that this kind of planning indeed touches on peoples' private lives. It is inevitable. A sound economy is needed in these new areas; they can't take chances. They need reliable people, so they are very carefully selected and tested. Sometimes batteries of tests for all sorts of things are used, not just to determine whether they are financially able. There are many more applicants than places. The number of tradesmen, for example, in each new community is limited, so those selected have a chance at making a decent living. Even religion enters into it. They try in these communities to match general social patterns of the entire country, so that one town would not become completely Catholic or virtually socialist.

To a degree, this rigorous kind of selection could be called an invasion of privacy, but the Dutch have come to the conclusion that lack of restrictions, lack of planning, causes eventually a much greater erosion of privacy, the kind of erosion that is caused by chaos, by poverty, and by fear. In any case, such detailed supervision ceases when there is no more need for it, when the areas have become integrated with the rest of the country.

There are of course complaints about this sort of thing. The Dutch are a very cantankerous nation. But generally intensive planning is accepted, and for two main reasons. In the first place, everyone there can see the need. In the second place, the very nature of this kind of comprehensive all-encompassing planning tends to spot and eliminate mistakes and points of possible friction before they have a chance to occur.

Over the centuries Netherlanders have learned the hard way how foolish it is to economize on the building of dikes, how stupid it is to leave essential matters to chance. And they were fortunate, because of their historical situation, to have been forced into this attitude. As a matter of fact, it was always everyone's responsibility to look after the dikes. If the dike breaks, everyone is required to work on it. This has been the law for about 1500 years. So Dutch history has forced a national awareness of the close relationship between surroundings and survival. Now in a different, but an equally urgent way, it seems to me, that this link between surroundings and survival is at the root of the American urban crisis.

What kind of planning do we throw into the breach? Of course there are exceptions, but generally our planning here is piecemeal, discontinuous, and isolated. There is frequent rivalry between planning groups within certain areas, and I suppose that is natural. General Motors planners, in line of duty, plan against Ford planners. So often, it seems to me, our public planners, living in the same atmosphere, plan against each other and not with each other. Competition may be the lifeblood of business but it isn't exactly a boon in urban improvement. I think a telling example of this is the redundancy of planning bodies and the overlapping of governmental units evident in the recent guerrilla warfare between the City of Portland and Multnomah County. Mayor Terry Schrunk has accused the County Commissioners of using revenues that he says ought to go to the city. Maybe there is something to the argument. But this is not a very heartening thing to have happen in one's community. The only possibly amusing aspect of all this squabbling is that it may turn into a local version of Terry and the Pirates.

Our prevalent piecemeal approach to planning means applying the great skills of specialists to the symptoms of the urban sickness as they come up. What is needed, of course, is bodies of experts to establish the relationship between symptoms and root causes. Take the painting of our bridges about which there was such furor. I think it's fine; I'm all in favor of it, if only for the fact that it distracts my eyes from the horrible things we have done to our waterfront. But far uglier than, say, the unpainted Burnside Bridge, is what happens in human terms on, under, and around that bridge. That's the real community eyesore. You can't paint over human misery. Most metropolitan problems are interrelated, and only team research and comprehensive planning can solve them; this is what we need, or we'll be right back in the Book of Genesis where it says:

"The earth was without form." I refuse to accept the idea that in order to have an economy of abundance you have to take a mess along with it. I don't believe that an economy need float on waste and chaos and innumerable profitable and irrelevant ingenuities, when human essentials are often lacking. I think we need to establish a system of priorities of human needs.

Control is not inherently evil. Surely the center line on all our highways infringes only on the freedom of idiots. Change is fast and inevitable. We all agree to that. History teaches us that unless change is managed, disasters occur. The essence of this needed management is planning, public planning. Robert A. Futterman in a book about this (The Future of Our Cities, New York, 1961) puts it very well. He said: "Planning the conservation of our natural and human resources is fundamentally no different than creating a legal system to establish orderly relations in our society." According to Justice Felix Frankfurter, the American Constitution is in essence a way of ordering society, a master plan.

If we want to establish a true multi-dimensional democracy, as I think most of us really want, a democracy for every citizen, we must first gain public acceptance of public planning; essential to that is the most widespread public participation in the planning process. For you simply can't plan for people, you must plan with them. It is precisely here, in the ignored area of participatory urban democracy, that I see the major function for the kind of programing I outlined in my introductory remarks. And, in fact, I would like the theme of goofing and planning to run through every "Urban Mosaic" event.

Continuing higher education spokesmen express themselves as eager to help solve community problems. But how can higher education do this with any hope of success, if it remains virtually out of touch with the community where these problems exist and where the people affected by them live? It seems to me that educational television (and radio) offers the most promising means of bridging the gap between continuing higher education and the needs of our urban population as a whole, on all levels.

Continuing higher education, while it talks enough, must learn to listen also. Too many voices remain unheard, too many signs of trouble overlooked. Everyone must be consulted in a viable community. There may be "bit-players" in a democracy, but by definition "extras" there cannot be. As Shaw said: "Democracy reads well; but it doesn't act well, like some people's plays." True, but what even G.B.S. did not anticipate is the degree to which citizens have stopped being (have been denied being, frequently) actors in the play of democracy. This in itself is a critical community problem, and needs priority attention if we in higher education seriously hope to help cure the other ills arising from increasing urbanization. I, for one, intend to do my utmost on "Urban Mosaic" to create conditions of open-mindedness and trust under which even the shy and the usually intimidated will feel free to speak their minds.

That's why, advocate of planning as I am, I am utterly opposed to any kind of rigid, impersonal, autocratic planning, imposed by authority. I am afraid of planners with a total, final solution, fanatical planners who re-double their efforts after they have completely lost sight of their objective, to paraphrase Santayana. I am afraid of planners who don't consult, don't listen. I am afraid of bureaucratic planners in the grip of some abstract, utopian concept. Zealous, self-righteous planning is worse than no planning at all. History may not tell us what to do, but surely history gives us lot of hints as to what we should not do in this regard.

There's no question about the need for planning. There is also no question of the very real risks, the dangers involved in planning, in the very notion of it. To me the only safeguard against adverse effects of planning is widespread citizen involvement in every step of every planning operation. There lies the key. What we need is planning by humans, for humans, with humans, with the emphasis on the human; a kind of planning that is conscious of both change and chance, conscious also of the indubitable charms of disorder. Nothing too tidy.

The kind of planning I have in mind is a way of living and it depends in large extent, I suspect, on the degree to which we can make people personally autonomous in a mass society, to make them speak up, to make them care, to make them feel a part of the community, and not outside it. I think planning and alienation are very closely related. Civic involvement is the very opposite of alienation, of disaffection.

So what do we do? I think we could well start by following Henry James's advice to a young novelist. He said: "Try to be a person on whom nothing is lost, finally aware and richly responsible." This is a difficult task in an age in which the mass media threaten to communicate us to death, in an age of distractions and deadening of sensibilities, in an age where greed and ambition all too often blind the necessary vision. But we have no choice. There can be no responsibility without personal awareness, without personal involvement. It seems to me that in an ideal situation every person would ask himself every day: "Who is goofing with my future now, with the future of my city, my country, my planet?"

General Leslie Groves, of A-bomb fame, believes that a properly trained soldier does not need to know what he is fighting for, does not have to be convinced of the righteousness of his cause, as long as his superiors know it. This is a point of view that is implicitly accepted, for example, by Robert Moses, the great autocratic New York planner, who, I find, is something of a hero in Portland as far as planning is concerned. I will let another general answer General Groves: "Nuts." Too many of us have treated ourselves, and often have been treated, as docile soldiers in the urban civil war around us. General Groves believes a personal sense of involvement is unnecessary. I say the very lack of it is the root of our problems. Robert Browning must have felt this when he prayed: "Make no more giants, Lord, but elevate the race."

A LOVER'S QUARREL WITH PAGEANTRY*

This is the week when, every year since I've come to Portland, I have had a problem; my Rose Festival Week syndrome, you might call it. This year I would like to share it with you. Part of it is my favorite march. I used to walk behind our hometown brass band for miles, hoping they would play it again. It's called "Alte Kameraden," a German march: "Old Comrades." And some old comrades the Germans turned out to be since I was a child! One of their military bands was playing "Old Comrades" in my hometown square a few days after the invasion of the Netherlands and the bombing of Rotterdam.

I've always liked marches and parades and pageantry. And who doesn't? But ever since I got involved in a war myself I have felt uneasy about liking those things. I have acutely ambivalent feelings when I attend a tattoo in Europe and revel in the sound and color of massed bands. I hate myself for enjoying this mindless watching. I have a lover's quarrel with pageantry. And when I express misgivings about it, this is not to condemn out of hand our local marching and parading this week. I merely want to ponder, to reflect with you on it this week when it's relevant, when you can sample parades by just opening your windows.

As always I am not altogether sure of my position so I'll submit some of my arguments to you. I am not so much speaking for myself tonight as speaking to myself. This, after all, is an essay, a trying-out of notions.

It's easy, in retrospect, to dislike the stupendous Nazi party rallies, which helped to seduce an entire Christian nation into a state of barbarism, or, say, those endless Russian parades on Red Square. But where do you draw the line on marching or parading, on eye-lulling pageantry?

Let's begin by looking at martial music historically. It underlies most pomp and circumstance. Grove's Dictionary of Music is quite unambiguous: march music was originally and basically associated with military movements, with war. It was meant to stimulate the troops to fight better. Professor Allen, who was the organist at Stanford when I was there, says in a book on the subject: "No form of music has been ingrained more deeply than the march in the habits of Western man since the beginning of his history." To me this is a most ominous sentence. When hordes of barbarians went to war, they needed the excitement of rhythmical noise. We apparently still do. Egyptians used it, Assyrians, Greeks, Romans, all of them, except possibly for a period in the Middle Ages when there is no evidence of orderly parades, but when there were the disorderly penitential processions of the fanatic flagellants as, for example, portrayed in the film The Seventh Seal.

---

*Edited transcript of a talk from the television series, Urban Mosaic, presented on KOAP-TV and KOAC-TV, June 9, 1965.

Modern march music begins with the Reformation, particularly with the Thirty Years' War in Germany. (It was not accidental that a number of the brutal soldiers' marches of that war were revived by the Nazis in the thirties.) Tortuous narrow medieval streets were rebuilt into straight, wide avenues to accommodate parades. Progress via war requires martial music, and is apparently often very effective. Napoleon claimed the weird battle music of the Cossacks helped to defeat his best regiments in Russia. And his defeat at Waterloo is generally credited largely to the 42nd Highlanders excited to a pitch by their bagpipes.

While march music became respectable in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in the symphonic music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, still its main use was in war. All this came to a climax in the last half of the nineteenth century, the heyday of imperialism and the white man's burden, when the rising tide of nationalism demanded, it seems, renewed emphasis on pageantry, on pomp and circumstance. The church was integrated into the effort, and we get that classic of Sullivan's (as unfunny as the rest of Gilbert and Sullivan is funny), "Onward Christian Soldiers, Marching as to War." And they marched—Christians most of them—to annihilate each other by the millions in World War I.

After this war, these pseudo-heroic rituals were temporarily deflated. Ford Madox Ford wrote his great series of novels called Parade's End, of which the second one is No More Parades. But soon the marching and the pageantry and the dying started all over again. And after World War II, parades began to warm up the cold war, inevitably. The renaissance of tattoos in Europe continues unabated. People love to watch large, loud, moving events to escape the monotony of life, even in the age of television, it appears. You watch those colorfully dressed bands marching and it thrills you and war becomes once again a charming romantic game. As I said, it gets me too. It appeals to the lust of the eye, as the Bible puts it. But it worries me profoundly.

We take so much for granted. For instance, someone ought to do a study of the lyrics of national anthems and songs, those corollaries of march music, those singing commercials of nationalism, those hymns to jingoism, most of them. As children we used to sing, with tears in our eyes, "Wiens Neerland's Bloed . . .": "Proud is he with Dutch blood in his veins, free from foreign taints." Speaking of racialism . . . ! Our Frisian national anthem deals with "boiling blood." It is interesting how many do deal with blood (think of the French one), culminating in the obscene Nazi anthem about Jewish blood spurting from their knives. Our anthem says Friesland is the best land on earth. They all do: "Deutschland, Deutschland Ueber Alles"; and Britain always "victorious, happy and glorious"; and the U. S.: "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

The pomp and joy of parading often turns into the pain and blood of war. Let's compare two processions for a minute. First, there is Gentile Bellini's Procession in the Square of St. Marks. Venice set the standards for this sort of thing in the fifteenth century, but hundreds of courts in Europe put on cavalcades, parades of this kind regularly. Immense ostentation to impress the populace, to control them in effect, to overawe them, make them aware of the great power of the princes, the church, and the merchants: ritual as social control.

Artists not only just painted these spectacles. Great artists designed them often: Leonardo, Veronese, Tintoretto, and in Flanders: Van der Goes, Memlinc, and, later Rubens worked on parades. Birth, deaths, weddings, receptions, saint's days, any excuse was used for extravagant displays, elaborate ceremonies, unlimited lavishness. Naked women in great numbers often rode on the floats. (We dress them a little now.)

After the Reformation these processions became even more propaganda devices. They became a weapon against Protestantism, as all baroque art is. While in 1519 Charles V was welcomed in Antwerp with scenes of unbelievable lavishness and joy, in 1540 the Spanish conquerors forced the neighboring but rebellious city of Ghent to stage a pageant of humiliation and defeat, all in black, with the leading citizens parading on their knees.

Festive parades changed into something else until they became what we can see in the painting of Pieter Brueghel, The Procession to Calvary, depicting victims of the atrocities of the Inquisition. Brueghel saw these things, put them in allegorical form. In a real sense he was a resistance painter; Rubens was a collaborator. This is a shocking counterpoint to the parades Rubens helped design. There is a record of a parade in Brussels in 1549 which had a cat-organ in it, a special organ. It looked like an organ but the pipes contained tied cats which had their tails pinched when the keys were struck. Their howls of agony provided the music. This is what Breughel depicts: the howls of agony of entire populations, forever fed up with the propaganda and attractions of the lavish parades, in these two great paintings called The Triumph of Death and Mad Meg.

These paintings make a telling comparison. Others would do the same, say, paintings of before and just after the French revolution. They raise the question, which is the theme of this essay: Why do parades so often turn into their very opposite; splendor turning into horror; many little, harmless, joyous parades becoming somehow, overnight almost, the Big Parade with the millions of dead? I am not suggesting a cause-and-effect relationship here, but what is it that makes these two kinds of parades so often appear in tandem, with the horrible ones following the splendid ones?

The magnificent parades of Edwardian England and Wilhelm's Germany turned into the senseless carnage of World War I. (Think of the criminal formal marches out of the trenches on the Somme in 1916.) The Nazis who paraded so joyfully became the guards with vicious police dogs lining the routes of the processions to the concentration camps and the gas ovens. Splendor into horror, from the beginning of time.

What has historically been the function of pageantry, of parades? Not joy, not fun, but the desire to impress, to stun, to overwhelm, to sell a bill of goods, religious, political, military, or commercial. Pageantry always was a device to inspire dread and awe, often for people and ideas not in themselves awe-inspiring. Pageantry historically was a means to establish or maintain power and privilege. Let me give you an example, admittedly extreme but it poses the problem sharply, the inspiration of awe with a vengeance.

In 1860 Mutesa had just got his grip on the Kingdom of Buganda in East Africa. How did he keep power? Well, here is one device: when he walked, he affected an extraordinary stiff-legged strut which was meant to imitate the gait of a lion. Silly, sure, but effective, like the goose-step. (Come to think of it, imitating a goose is a revealing action in itself.) And are some of the contemporary rituals of royalty any less silly, such as walking backwards out of their presence? But Mutesa used other, less harmless devices. As Alan Moorehead points out in The White Nile where I got this information: "Unless the ruler surrounded himself with an atmosphere of dread and superstitious awe, he did not stay long on his throne." We have dispensed with this kind of dread nowadays; we've sublimated it into awe, an awe still inspired artificially with the aid of pageantry and ritual, costuming and marching. We never learn. In this respect, it is telling to compare two English girls named Elizabeth.

Elizabeth II, a nice homebody, utterly unremarkable by herself, an English country-lady loving horses, who needs all the trappings of make-believe pageantry to be a queen.

And Elizabeth Taylor, needing no pomp or pageantry to be another kind of queen, having an overwhelming femininity of her own which allows her to romp around as she pleases, to appear in public with hair tumbled, without make-up, in slacks, and depend only on her striking face and those violet eyes to be impressive.

Or compare in World War II Winston Churchill in his boiler suit, with General Patton in his operatic uniforms and his pearl-handled revolvers. Churchill didn't need the trappings. Patton was suspended from them as if from a balloon.

Having grown up in a monarchy, it has always seemed odd to me that this republic, of all countries, is more awestruck by what the Shah of Iran aptly called the "king business" than any other nation—West Germany excluded—but including those nations outfitted with kings, queens, and shahs.

The Shah, indeed, is not very popular back in his own country, Royalty, in most places where it still hangs on, has come under ever-increasing criticism by its own subjects. Royal immunity from criticism is virtually a thing of the past. Maybe that is why so many royal and noble personages periodically visit the United States, so they can bask in our uncritical adulation. A dose of that probably keeps them going for quite a while back home.

What has been lacking in our mental, in our moral diet that we are impressed by this outmoded institution called royalty? And as the genuine product is getting scarce, we manufacture dynasties of pseudo-royalty of our own: kings of this and queens of that, and battalions of princesses everywhere. Baffling, really baffling.

For the past two months I have scrutinized our local newspapers for educational news, desperately needed especially on race and education issues. Very little has appeared. What did we get daily as educational news? Hundreds of columns of bland text and pictures of selections of Rose princesses in our high schools. Clearly, a high priority matter: those sweet girls now being dragged through town, chaperoned by elderly men in white flannel suits.

The United States has become the greatest market for coats-of-arms, family crests. Almost 20,000 names, I read, are entitled to carry a family crest. Ridiculous. Maybe I'm making a fuss about a small thing, but this to-do with royal courts, princesses, coronations, bothers me, however innocent I'm sure the fun is. To what gods are we symbolically sacrificing these robed virgins riding in the various corn festival parades of the nation?

Maybe I'm too sensitive, but I'm bothered also by the phalanxes of high school bands in attendance, blaring away like mad. Fine kids, but have you ever considered the fortunes in uniforms and instruments marching past? We could build a number of schools with that money. Or the drum majorettes, those Lolitas on parade, advertising something they're surely not selling. Am I being too forbidding, too austere, too Calvinistic, too bitter? Too old? Too existentialist? Have your pick.

Let me give you another reason why I feel the way I do. What's more harmless than the fun, the half-time activities at a college football game? Especially at Harvard, say 1907. Now that fun, those activities were Harvard's gift to Hitler.

Let me introduce you to Ernst Sedgwick Hanfstaengl, known as Putzi, Harvard Class of 1909. His mother was American, a Boston Sedgwick, and his father was a wealthy Munich art dealer. Putzi lived in this country for fifteen years. He was introduced to Hitler by an American military attache in 1922, and a beautiful friendship resulted. This man bankrolled Hitler and his movement when it was broke. This man gave Hitler respectability, made him socially acceptable in 1922. He hid him after the abortive putsch. This man played Hitler to sleep with Wagner. This political playboy provided a large share of the thrust that put Hitler's monstrous career in an early orbit.

They had a falling out in the late thirties and Putzi fled to England, where he was interned. Through FDR he was admitted to the United States, over British protests, as "advisor on psychological warfare." He gave talks to our group of OSS trainees in the FBI Building early in 1944. But I'll never call myself his pupil.

He is still hale and hearty at 78 and lives in a luxurious section of Munich, and he still admires Hitler.

I want to read you one paragraph of his autobiography, Unheard Witness, published in 1957:

> I started playing some of the football marches I had picked up at Harvard. I explained to Hitler all the business about the cheer leaders and college songs and the deliberate whipping up of hysterical enthusiasm. I told him about the thousands of spectators being made to roar, "Harvard, Harvard, Harvard, rah, rah, rah!" in unison and of the hypnotic effect of this sort of thing. I played him some of the Sousa marches to show how it could be done by adapting German tunes, and gave them all that buoyant beat so characteristic of American brass-band music. I had Hitler fairly shouting with enthusiasm. "That is it, Hanfstaengl, that is what we need for the movement, marvelous," and he pranced up and down the room like a drum majorette. After that he had the SA band practicing the same thing. "Rah, rah, rah!" became "Sieg Heil, Sieg Heil"—that is the origin of it, and I suppose I must take my share of the blame.*

From Harvard Stadium to Nuremberg Stadium. Harvard pageantry fitted Hitler's purposes excellently. Nazi parades became virtual rapes of the mind by appealing to the latent subconscious notions of spectators, until eventually the individual had no more of a function than a banner, an ornament, a torch. Parades were used as instruments of contempt for people.

---

*Ernst Sedgwick Hanfstaengl, Unheard Witness (Philadelphia, 1957), pp. 52-53.

I want you to look at a film sequence[*] and see under your very eyes persons becoming depersonalized, dehumanized, armored against the human compassion without which civilization ceases to function. Here are German marches, Hitler worship, and Nazi parades, ending on the well-known shot of an elderly Jewish spectator. That face has haunted me for many years. It constitutes, in fact, my main argument against parades. To me it sums up all the sadness, all the pain that so frequently follows the pleasures of parading. In one image you have the essence of the aftermath of mindless revelry. From Harvard to Hitler, from Hitler to horror: a sequence connected by pomp, pageantry, parades.

Now I am not at all suggesting that there is anything evil in the parades connected with the Rose Festival. They're perfectly harmless, I suppose. But you won't catch me watching them, out of principle. You've got to start somewhere putting a principle into effect. And what better place than at home in our own surroundings? Come to think of it, the enjoyment of roses is such a personal, private affair. How did the rose ever get mixed up with parades?

My conclusion, then, is that parades, whether put on for a laudable or for a suspect purpose, have one basic, disturbing, anti-democratic tendency: they are intended to overwhelm, to lull the mind, in order to put something over, to sell something over, packaged as fun. Parades historically are what we would nowadays call hard-sell devices. In a society in which religion was the main institution, they were called processions. In a society run by aristocrats, it's pageantry. In a militaristic one it's rigid parading, an exploitation by force. And now in our society, where business is the institution setting the tone, it's what you might call permissive parading, in effect making the consumer sell himself. Our parades are promotional stunts for business in general, or certain organizations in particular. Our parades are permissive exploitations of people, exploitation by persuasion, decried so eloquently by Joseph Wood Krutch.

In principle no nation is more concerned than ours with individualism, with personal autonomy, integrity. If we are truly serious about this, I propose that what we need are fewer awe-inspiring, impersonal and overwhelming, and more irreverent, more thought-provoking events.

---

[*] In the original presentation, the author presented an eight-minute film sequence.

Maybe here there is a clue to distinguish one kind of parade from another. Take the Merrykhana parade of last Saturday: it really was not a parade at all, but a parody of one: a floating fun game, a mobile amateur vaudeville show. In its very nature a series of individual acts involving the audience.

Or consider, on the other hand, the March on Washington in 1963. Again, it was wrongly named: it was not a march at all but a mass walk, accompanied by folk music, protest songs, but not by marching bands. That was truly one of the major thought-provoking mass events of this decade.

I can understand the need for certain kinds of pageantry as ritual. The Kennedy and Churchill funerals come to mind. These were distinguished by a clear unity of purpose, execution, and effect. They represented a full stop to a period in history, a necessary punctuation for the end of chapters in the lives of all of us.

But think of the wide gaps between purpose, execution, and effect in our common variety of parades: what does a St. Patrick's Day parade have to do with Ireland, or a Columbus Day parade with Italy, or a Labor Day parade with labor? At least our Rose Parade does involve roses!

Mindless, passive watching of any kind erodes moral values, because morality depends on action, on personal action. That's why marching seems an insult—however slight—to human dignity to me: it diminishes the marcher and the spectator alike. We ought to know by now the risks of impersonal mass behavior of any kind. Maybe it's simply my existential way of thinking that causes my misgivings about pageantry. The one thing I can't imagine is a parade of existentialists. For the word "existence" comes from the Latin verb exsistere, meaning literally: to stand apart from, to stand forward, to stand by oneself.

In any case I believe we must find essentially personal, individual, active ways to demonstrate. We must learn to impress without mental or physical coercion. And each must find his own way in terms of own awareness, and self-respect. For some it's sit-ins or freedom rides or walks, for others speaking out, writing letters. There are hundreds of ways short of parading, none of them requiring pageantry, that remnant of an age of privilege.

We must stand forward by ourselves in our own way, and we will find that we are not standing alone, for history is teaching more and more people that all too often the pussyfoot leads to the goose-step, of one kind or another.

And there you have my contribution to Rose Festival Week.

TO STOP LIVING THE LIE[*]

I wanted to make a contribution to this subject of counseling minority youth that was all mine; one that was based on my own knowledge, and on my interests. I am very much aware that all the speakers here this week are specialists and scholars, speaking from the security of their own disciplines. I envy them that security because I don't have any. I am an academic amateur. I am not even sure I believe in what you people are doing in counseling. I myself, all my life have rejected all the counsel that was ever given me. So I speak for no discipline, I speak for no school of psychology, I speak for no trend in educational philosophy; I speak only for myself.

On contemplating what I could do here, it occurred to me last week, after a lot of thought, that I have two qualifications that at least serve as an excuse for my standing here and taking up your time. In the first place, I used to be a minority youth, and so I have an abiding interest in minorities in general. In the second place, I once knew a minority youth well. So, on these two qualifications, whatever I say here must rest.

Now, I said I am a minority youth. I happen to belong to the Frisian minority of the Netherlands. Most people here won't know that the Netherlands has two languages. Frisians have a language and culture of their own; I didn't learn to speak Dutch until I was six. All the schooling was in Dutch, however; when I grew up they didn't allow the teaching of Frisian in the schools. So, even after twenty-four years in this country writing my mother at least once a week, when I can, we write to each other in Dutch, even though we have never spoken anything but Frisian to each other. The Hollanders used to look down on us as a bunch of peasants. As I said, we were not allowed to use our own language, at least not up to the time that I left in 1938. An interesting thing is that during the war, the Frisian resistance was extremely important in the Netherlands. So after the war, acceptance was gained for Frisian culture and the Frisian language.

---

[*] An address to the Conference on Counseling Minority Youth, Portland, Oregon, August 13-17, 1962.

This fight for identity is not unique; it has happened to other minorities in Europe—the Basques, the Welsh, the Irish, the Catalans, etc.—and I think it is a good thing. I think the more variety, the better. I think many of the great British writers were, in effect, minority writers. They were Irish like Shaw and Joyce, Welsh like Dylan Thomas, or Scottish like Walter Scott. You can easily find more examples.

Belonging to a minority within a majority culture makes you what sociologists call "a marginal man"—a man with one foot in each of two cultures. It is an odd position, but I find it a useful one, because it gives you the marvelous advantage of seeing one culture from the perspective of the other; because you see more clearly, your views are less culture-bound. What happens when you maintain three cultures as I do—Frisian, Dutch, and American—I leave for you to decide. But I do believe that there is considerable merit to the argument which holds that truly aware American Negroes see our country's situation and its future, sharper and clearer, more honestly and more comprehensively than non-minority Americans, no matter how aware.

As I have said, my interest in minorities goes way back to my youth, to occurrences such as the time when at eighteen I wanted desperately to work as a journalist on an Amsterdam newspaper. They wouldn't accept me because they were afraid that I didn't speak Dutch properly, having lived in Friesland all my life. So I have some slight experience with job discrimination. I am not, of course, comparing it with the immense problem we are concerned with here; but I do think incidents like the above had a great deal to do with the fact that, at nineteen, I came to the United States.

And from my first day in this country in May, 1938, I sought knowledge, first hand and through study, of America's minorities. I was particularly interested, of course, in our Negro minority, which is our main minority after the virtual genocide practiced on the Indians. Firsthand knowledge of Negroes I found very difficult to obtain, and I still do. It is a problem we haven't licked yet. You can't just wander in and say, "I want to get to know you and your problems; I want to be friends." Naturally, minority peoples are suspicious, as all victims of colonialism are suspicious of members of the ruling class. (Other countries had their colonies outside, we have ours inside, but the principle remains.) Friendship isn't something that you can force; it must grow naturally and spontaneously. I think the major purpose of segregation is to keep us from each other so that we cannot naturally grow and become friends. I think that's why housing and job discrimination here in Portland is as lethally effective as the more dramatic and awful practices of the South. The result is the same; we do not get to know each other on a common basis, either as neighbors or as colleagues.

I had trouble getting to know Negroes in my first two years in this country. I spent those two years at Stanford University; it was then a lovely, isolated academic country club. There were no Negroes. That baffled me for a long time. Later when I moved to Los Angeles and Hollywood it became easier. Through mutual friends, I met many Negroes of my age who shared my interests—literature, art, and especially films. I joined the Junior Council of the NAACP, and I participated in its activities, which at that point were largely focused on getting qualified Negroes employment in the aircraft and other defense industries. If you have to die for a country you ought to get some benefit from it, too. I suspect that having an accent was a telling factor in my being accepted by Negroes. That is quite an irony, and I think it's probably why I have never tried to get rid of it.

I gained one special friend during those years in Los Angeles, and I want to tell you a little bit about him. His name was John Kinlock. He was the managing editor of what was then the principal Negro newspaper in California, the California Eagle, which was owned and edited by his aunt. John was a good writer; he was widely read; he was a relaxed, humorous person; he liked being a Negro, at least he was at home in it. I think his reading had given him a perspective on himself, and although I suspect he was not particularly happy being a Negro in this country there was nothing he could do about that. On one point, he was hurtfully frustrated and so was I. Like me, he was a great film enthusiast. I was working in the studios then—I had a minor job as assistant director. It sounds important—it's just kind of being a stooge. But at least I was working at the studios on the set with people making pictures. I had a lot of good friends, and we tried to get Johnny a job. We never got anywhere. And he was eminently qualified; he was a fine writer. That was about the time Walter White (who was then head of the NAACP) was in

Hollywood, reading the riot act to the studio executives, telling them they ought to do right by the Negro, portray him right and also give him more jobs. This of course is a promise yet to be honored in Hollywood.

So John stayed on the Eagle, and he watched me suffer through six months while I was an assistant director on the first all-Negro motion picture that was ever made in a major studio. It was called "Stormy Weather," and it was a shambles and a fraud. You can find that out yourself; it is run frequently on television. Often on Thursday nights I came down and helped Johnny put the paper to bed, and we talked. We talked about many things, but one thing we talked about a lot was the Netherlands, about my home country in which Johnny had become interested. There is no discrimination there, I told him. It is a lovely country, and I was homesick, so of course, I made it nicer, and we talked about going back there after the war and making films.

Well, to make a long story short, we both got to the Netherlands; I joined the Office of Strategic Services, and Johnny Kinlock joined the Army. Johnny Kinlock was killed one day before the end of the war in Europe. He is now buried in the shade of a hill where I used to sit and write poems when I was sixteen. That hill is now part of the huge American Army Cemetery at Margraten in the southern Netherlands. So Johnny got to my land of birth, and I am now a citizen of his. And it gives me a responsibility—a great one.

So, I asked myself "What would John want me to tell you?" What can I say here that at least would not have annoyed him, that will not insult his memory? What can the fortuitous, accidental possessor of one kind of skin say about those with skins absurdly, irrationally and agonizingly less acceptable than his, somehow? What can one say? What arrogance to any anything at all! But maybe the following remarks are not too presumptuous.

Basically what I want to say to you is that the Civil War is not over. In spite of all the talk of celebrations, of commemorations, it is not finished. You are fighting in it, and if you are not, you ought to be, or you shouldn't be here. Let me elaborate a little. I am sure that many sincere people are engaged in these celebrations. The world is full of people of good will; the only problem is that we need intelligence as well! It is true that the Civil War has a crucial meaning in our history, and certainly one cannot object to the fostering of a true awareness of our historical heritage. One might even tolerate the Southern need to romanticize an ugly past if these festivities give them some comfort. But there is, in fact, little if any evidence that these ballyhooed events have led to a broader knowledge or a more mature understanding of the past. The evidence, to me, indicates the opposite: it has increased tensions, and it has resharpened old antagonisms. I think the giveaway lies in the fact that most of the current literature about the Civil War is concerned with largely military, heroic topics. Most of the so-called celebrations consist of Southern apologetics. The main thing stressed is the glory and the glamor and the romance of the war; most of the horror is left out. Above all, it is telling that Negroes rarely have a part in the celebrations.

The falsity and the utter impropriety is further pointed up by the fact that the war is celebrated by the wrong people, the self-styled Civil War "buffs." Now a "buff" is a devotee, a fan, enthusiast for something, like skin diving or coin collecting. But by what processes of thought does one get to declare oneself a buff of war? Of any war, but particularly of this bloodiest fraternal war ever, in which six hundred and twenty thousand people died, most of them in great agony? I think the show is given away when people make a hobby of war. To call oneself a "Civil War buff" is like calling oneself a "cancer buff" or a "concentration camp buff." The very immorality of this attitude brings home to me the realization that the Civil War is not over yet.

The way in which Civil War battles are re-enacted brings this out also. At immense expense, and with great accompanying commercialization, battles are staged in which either the South wins or the re-enactment stops short of events that may embarrass the tourists. The apparent Southern love for playing soldiers in re-enactments of these grisly events further indicates that something is wrong, as does the entire distasteful Civil War industry which has sprung up. You know, all the souvenirs—the cigarette lighters that play "Dixie," made in Japan, all the unnecessary and useless books and recordings produced by eager hustlers trying to make a killing out of those frightful killings of a century ago. That gives the show away too. No wonder that Holiday wrote: "It would be hard to find another nation that would mock itself with such cheerful cynicism." That's looking at it rather more kindly than I do.

It is, of course, no accident that few Negroes participate in these shenanigans, or that the first meeting of the National Centennial Commission in Charleston, North Carolina, was marked by racial discrimination, or that the official speaker at the first Virginia event reviled Lincoln, and advocated some of the very things the Civil War was supposed to have done away with. It all figures. I can understand a South that feels itself defeated, still wanting to dream up a romantic past, if only to help anaesthetize the immense burden of guilt that must exist there. But I personally gag at having these myths, these lies, crammed down my throat. And I want no more of it.

For I believe that the majority of these commemorations serve to help perpetuate the status quo in the South, and by inference all over the nation. They represent an anti-integration effort, a fond look backward to the time when the Negroes were kept in their "places." My point is that the Civil War was never properly finished, so there is no real reason to commemorate its ending yet. Now please understand, I am not saying we ought to take up arms and finish it. Quite the contrary.

There may be controversy about many aspects of the Civil War but there is general agreement on the two fundamental causes. They were: (1) the preservation of the Union, and (2) the abolition of slavery. Lincoln himself named slavery as the cause of the conflict. The war was fought over the future status of the Negro in America. Now to me one of the major ironies of American history is to have to recognize the fact that the Union was saved indeed, but only at the expense of the second cause—the rights of the Negro. It is not too much to say that over the years the South was bribed to stay in the Union: a form of blackmail was practiced with the rights of the Negro as currency.

The crisis of our national conscience we keep hearing about does not concern our abundance in a world of want or our so-called declining morality; it does not concern Berlin, or Laos, or Castro. It concerns but one thing: our treatment of the Negro. As sure as John Kinlock is dead, I believe that. Slavery, to be sure, was legally abolished by the Civil War, but many of its ugliest aspects stayed behind extralegally, as payoffs to the South to preserve the Union. The Negro was cheated out of the gains the winning of the Civil War procured for him. You to whom I am speaking are the very evidence of this cheating. If the Negro had received the rights promised a century ago, we would have no need for counselors of "minority youth."

I don't mean to sound like a Fourth of July orator, but Lincoln spelled it out for us quite plainly in his Gettysburg Address, which is usually only recited ritually. Here are the lines: "It is for us the living . . . to be dedicated . . . to the unfinished work . . . to the great task remaining before us," which he defined later as "a new birth of freedom." This great task is still unfinished. Only now, after a full century, is the Negro beginning to enjoy some of the rights of this new birth of freedom. What is there to commemorate until we have finished Lincoln's great task?

And, at the rate we are going, it may be quite a while yet before it is finished. In spite of the Supreme Court decision of 1954, only 6 per cent of Negro pupils attend integrated schools. That is a gain of less than 1 per cent a year. At that rate it will be another century before complete integration is achieved. In nearly all other areas too the progress is slow. Johnny Kinlock would want me to tell you: "Please, do all in your power to hurry it along!" The proper speed here is full speed. An integrated school is just a beginning. For you see, in effect the South did win the Civil War. What gains the Negro made immediately after the war were nullified around the turn of the century, as Professor C. Vann Woodward—among other scholars—proves conclusively in his book The Strange Career of Jim Crow. Let me cite one small but telling example. In 1896 there were 130,334 Negroes registered to vote in Louisiana. In 1904 there were only 1,342!

The Gallup poll last year found a large number of Americans willing to die for the rights of the citizens of Berlin. How many of these, I wonder, would offer to die, say, for the rights of a Negro citizen in Albany, Georgia?

Of all people, you counselors must be most deeply aware of the high cost of discrimination to all of us, not only to the direct victims. You know firsthand how this unfinished part of the Civil War saps the strength and the well-being of the entire nation. You of all people, must know the truth of Booker T. Washington's remark that "You can't hold a man down in a ditch without staying down there with him."

This continuation, this true finishing of the Civil War, in which you are engaged is not being fought with force, but with faith, with guts, with intelligence, with the power of what Bruno Bettelheim calls, the informed heart. It is fought by people riding interstate buses, by students sitting at lunch counters, by ordinary citizens on buyers' strikes. It is fought in the only way wars should be fought: non-violently in the tradition of one of the greatest of all Americans, Henry Thoreau. It is not accidental that in this continuation of the Civil War, ministers, students, and teachers are the leaders. If you want to be effective counselors of minority youth, you must consider yourselves part of this truly illustrious company. And what better company could you want?

The fact that you don't live in the South is irrelevant. Unfortunately the battlefield is everywhere. Your very existence as counselors of minority youth proves how much remains to be done here in the West. None of us can be self-righteous about the South.

The Negro hero of the successful Broadway play Purlie Victorious puts the issue sharply: "We want our cut of the Constitution," he says, "not in a teaspoon but with a shovel." That's what John Kinlock would have said. You are not proper counselors of minority youth unless you help them get it—with a shovel. Anything short of that amounts to handing out mental bandaids. Bandaids are medicinal, but only just barely.

I would suggest that you turn a large part of your counseling activities into a form of preventive medicine. You must work to make your own jobs unnecessary, as I am sure many of you are already. You will be successful, I believe, as minority counselors inside of schools to the extent that you are active in minority work outside of school, for all the major problems lie outside. You are supposed to affect the motivations of minority youth; it would not do if your own motivations in this area were suspect to them. Lately in our country we have done too many things out of fear—fear of Russian progress, fear of what the Africans or the Indians would think, etc. We must learn to solve these problems for positive reasons, because we ourselves believe in them, not for ulterior purposes or motives. After all we are a nation born out of revolution and we still have a strong—though temporarily dormant—revolutionary tradition.

If you do not believe in change, you have no business in any kind of counseling, least of all in counseling of minority youth. Let me turn the tables on you; let me finish by having a minority youth counsel you. I don't know his or her name. I found the following words, unsigned, in a mimeographed leaflet of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee in Atlanta, Georgia:

Freedom . . . is to stop living the lie. Mankind is little people, because mankind is afraid to be. He lives in cracks, down behind pretences, there beneath reasons and excuses and pseudonyms. He is afraid of the sun because it is too bright, afraid of the rain because it is too clean, afraid of the air because it is too pure, afraid of his brother because he is too kin, and afraid of himself, well, because if he found that self he might not be able to find a place in which to put it. Man has to be put. He refuses, he cringes at the headland and will not be dragged out to the rim where he would have to lean over and look truth right smack in the face.

There is a chance now. We cannot believe that man will forever run. We must stop. And we have. We have stopped dead right up against that wall of fear that separates not Negro from white, but man from man and man from himself. Strip off the lies and let us have a look at nakedness. Let us care, care, care what we are and what we are doing. Let us know that the price of freedom is to stop living the lie.

THE LIBRARY OF
CONTINUING EDUCATION

NOTES AND ESSAYS ON EDUCATION FOR ADULTS 53

POLITICAL BACKGROUNDS
OF ADULT EDUCATION

Edited by: THOMAS CUMMINGS, JR.

CENTER for the STUDY OF LIBERAL
EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

at Boston University

POLITICAL BACKGROUNDS OF ADULT EDUCATION

The University In Urban Society

Edited by: **THOMAS CUMMINGS, JR.**
Director, The Humanistic Studies Center
Syracuse University

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**
at Boston University

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

PUBLICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Robert F. Campbell, *Clark University*
James T. Carey, *University of California*
John P. Dyer, *Tulane University*
Cyril O. Houle, *University of Chicago*
H. Lichtenstein, *Hofstra College*
Jack London, *University of California*
Ernest E. McMahon, *Rutgers University*
Russell F. W. Smith, *New York University*
Alan M. Thomas, *Canadian Association for Adult Education*
Clifford L. Winters, *Syracuse University*

CENTER PUBLICATIONS

Center publications on education of adults include the *Notes and Essays* series examining purposes and philosophy, *Reports* on methods and practices in the field, *Research Reports*, and *Occasional Papers*.

For a complete list and prices write:

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults *at Boston University*
138 Mountfort St.
Brookline, Mass. 02146

$1.75

THE CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS was established in 1951 by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with universities seeking to initiate or improve programs of liberal education for adults. In 1964 CSLEA affiliated with Boston University. The purpose of the Center is to help American higher education institutions develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults.

Copyright 1967 by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

PREFACE

The papers contained in this monograph were presented at a conference held in October, 1966 and sponsored jointly by University College (the Adult Education Division of Syracuse University) and the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

It was the fourth in a series of conferences, each followed by publication of the major papers, designed to increase the effectiveness of the administrators of adult education divisions of higher education by promoting a continuing dialogue between adult educators and scholars from related disciplines. The committee responsible for planning these annual deliberations have taken two points of departure. During the first two years, specific academic disciplines were selected as the focus, and conferences provided participants with an opportunity to discuss the research of psychologists and sociologists and its implications for adult education. In 1965 emphasis shifted to substantive operational problems which concern the university adult educator. Scholars and practitioners were invited to exchange ideas on "Dynamics of Change in the Modern University." The present conference followed the same line. Scholars (in most cases from political science) joined adult educators to consider "The University in Urban Society."

Although the 1966 conference, like the earlier ones, was primarily designed for adult educators, the issue of university involvement in education or service for urban life concerns the entire university, from its chief officer to the newest member of the faculty. Should the university try to effect social change? Can the university really influence the power centers of the big cities? What are the implications of intervention on traditional university roles? Such questions formed the basis for this conference and the papers provide provocative insights for anyone interested in this aspect of higher education.

Clifford L. Winters, Jr.
Syracuse University

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION . . . . Thomas F. Cummings, Jr. 1

URBAN DECISION-MAKING: THE UNIVERSITY'S ROLE . . . . Stephen K. Bailey 5

URBAN INSTITUTIONS AS UNIVERSITY CLIENTS . . . . Sanford L. Kravitz 17

POLITICS OF UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL CHANGE . . . . Alan K. Campbell 28

TEACHING AND RESEARCH: THEIR INFLUENCE ON SOCIAL CHANGE . . . . John E. Bebout 44

EDUCATING THE URBAN STUDENT FOR THE URBAN WAY OF LIFE . . . . Charles V. Willie 70

INTRODUCTION

by

Thomas F. Cummings, Jr.

The university occupies a position in American life that is at once secure and tenuous. It is secure by virtue of the premium we have always placed on American education, but tenuous by virtue of conflicting demands that it both preserve the status quo and educate for change, that it both stand above the stress and storm of daily events and move in where the action is.

Recently, there has been a growing tendency for the university to become immersed in current events, and in our kind of world this means to become involved in questions of change. After years in the ivory tower, the university suddenly finds itself thrust into new roles. In some cases it has leaped out of the tower; in others it has been pushed; and in many more instances it remains wavering, one foot in and the other over the wall, uncertain which way to go. In the past the emphasis of the university, at least as an institution, was safe and respectable—to search for and teach the truth with little immediate responsibility for the practical consequences of its pursuit. The leap from the ivory tower plunges the university into a world of action and practical affairs. There is pressure for research to serve immediate practical problems, for consultation on day-to-day issues, and for teaching to prepare people for specific action in contemporary events.

In large measure the change is less novel to extension than to any other part of the university. The extension division always has been responsible for service to an adult, largely action-oriented, population; it has operated with one foot in the academic community and the other in the outside world. Thus, questions about the role and scope of higher education, about the reconciliation of action and traditional impartiality, for example, have always been concerns of extension. With the turn of events in the modern world, these concerns take on new significance.

Not only do they involve larger and larger segments of the total university, but more important, revolutionary developments at home and abroad cry out for radical solutions and for drastic change upsetting to society and to university obligations as a conservative institution.

There is no need to recapitulate the issues and problems of modern society. All Americans are painfully aware of them because they press upon us every day of our lives. Suffice it to say that next to war and peace the most pressing and most inclusive problem facing us involves the creation of an effective way of urban life. It was for this reason that the committee responsible for the Syracuse conferences on the foundations of adult education selected the university in urban society as the subject for consideration in October, 1966. The conference was planned to deal with two basic questions: What is the extent and kind of university involvement in education for urban life? What are the implications of this involvement?

The panelists, whose papers are included in this monograph, take positions on these issues. The underlying disciplinary emphasis is political science, but the papers represent a variety of disciplines and experiences in urban affairs. Stephen K. Bailey and Alan K. Campbell come from the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University. In addition to their university connections, both men have direct experience in urban politics. John E. Bebout is Director of the Urban Studies Center at Rutgers University, where he has a major interest in urban research. Sanford L. Kravitz is on the faculty of the Florence Heller School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare at Brandeis University and is a former administrator at the Office of Economic Opportunity. Charles V. Willie is a visiting lecturer at Harvard, serving on the staff of a medical school mental health project. In addition to his academic qualifications, Willie has practical experience in the struggle for civil rights.

Although there were many variations of viewpoint, the papers and the conference reflect agreement on four points. First, each of the papers suggests that increasingly the university will be unable to withstand the pressures for involvement in urban society, if indeed it wished to. This involvement will result in a growing tension between town and gown: as external pressures are applied, they will make many faculty and administrators unhappy; at the same time an inability to go all the way will create unhappiness on the part of some segments of the society seeking university support.

Second, and of a less controversial nature, the papers agree that the university is responsible for pre-entry and mid-career training to prepare individuals for more effective urban public service.

A third question touched upon in all papers relates to the need for objectivity, detachment from the pressures of problem-solving to allow for contributions to universal knowledge. None of the authors believes that the application of knowledge to the immediate issues of urban life is incompatible with scholarly obligations to search for truth.

Finally, and in the same vein, the papers agree that there can and should be a practical relationship between the long-range research interests of social scientists and day-to-day urban problems. This can only be accomplished if the scholar is involved from the beginning. It is only in this manner that the scholar can obtain a complete view of the problem and appreciate his potential contribution to its solution. Too often the extension programs are assembled piecemeal. As a result, the individual scholar never sees how his contributions are related to the total effort or how the effort may relate to his broad research interests.

In summary, the five authors agree that the university must assume responsibility for education needed if we are to succeed in reshaping the urban environment. Although this means moving in where the action is and although this will cause tensions, the authors believe the responsibility can be exercised without violation to the university's traditional scholarly concerns. None of the writers tells us how to do it, but each suggests important reasons why it should be done and points out important questions that need answers in shaping policy for university education for modern urban life.

URBAN DECISION-MAKING: THE UNIVERSITY'S ROLE

by

Stephen K. Bailey

Bailey examines the various ways in which the university can and should influence urban decision-making. He sees the following as long-range roles for the university: pinpointing the problems urban decision-makers should deal with; discovering the root laws of human behavior; and finding answers to problems according to these laws. Among the short-range roles are: providing technical advice and educating urban decision-makers. But underlying all these roles is the central role of the university in regard to urban decision-making—sensitizing the decision-makers and the citizens to human misery.

Stephen K. Bailey is Professor of Political Science and Dean of the Maxwell Graduate School at Syracuse University. He has also taught at Wesleyan University, Princeton, Harvard, Oxford, and several other universities. His non-academic work has included such roles as Mayor of Middletown in Connecticut and Chairman of the Connecticut Democratic State Platform Committee.

URBAN DECISION-MAKING: THE UNIVERSITY'S ROLE

In the year 1904 a French artist, Paul Flandrin, was moved by a passage from the Gospel according to St. Luke to paint a picture entitled "Christ Mourns over the City." Ostensibly the painting illustrates the passage which reads, "And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, if thou hadst [only] known . . . the things which belong unto thy peace!"[1]

The artist has painted Christ in his traditional form, but instead of Jesus standing on Olivet overlooking Jerusalem, He looks down from Montmartre upon Paris. In the foreground are closely packed tenements. The air is filled with the smog of a great industrial metropolis. Three large churches rise gently above the thick air, but their towers are not illumined by the sun. The human misery and the injustices of the city are simply implied by the aesthetic squalor.

Flandrin's painting and the biblical text underlining it come close to defining the modern university's role in urban decision-making. For one role is to weep; the other is to ponder the things which belong to the city's peace.

Weeping, like fainting, is less fashionable now than it once was. Perhaps modern man has become so inured to injustice and terror that he has lost the capacity for compassion. Perhaps, as the poet reminds us, "The damned don't cry." Or, perhaps, the more prosperous American middle class has simply become so isolated in its suburban castles and so protected from social reality by the steel and chrome of its automobiles, that it no longer recognizes what it sees or feels what it recognizes. Or perhaps television has made all human drama unreal. Close-ups of urban race riots become macabre entertainment—shocking, but quite as distant, ephemeral, and unreal as a class "B" movie or "The Man from U.N.C.L.E."

In any case, if in truth we no longer know how to weep, the university has an obligation to help society regain this lost capacity. For unless the urban decision-makers of the future, and their supporting citizenry, have hearts that are troubled, urban decisions will continue to be made quite as callously and selfishly as they have been made in the past.

---

1. Luke 19:41, 42.

And if urban decisions continue to be so made, we can expect metropolitan living to become increasingly ugly, degrading, and threatening.

A few years ago, Professor Elmer Schattschneider of Wesleyan University asked his students to write papers on their home towns. One wealthy product of Bronxville, New York, one of the garden spots of Westchester County, ended his effusive essay with the proud statement, "The greatest thing about Bronxville is that it has no slums." Across this final page, Professor Schattschneider wrote in his gargantuan handwriting, "The slums of Bronxville are the Bronx!"—a professor attempting to educate a student to weep.

All this is another way of saying that one of the university's main responsibilities is social criticism. It shares this responsibility with other institutions in the society—especially the home, the church, the political party, and the press; but since increasingly the university educates those who man these other societal posts, it has a primary obligation to keep social criticism alive and responsible.

There are those, of course, who claim that feeling is the enemy of science, that higher education has no responsibility for sensitizing the emotional and value premises of students, that social criticism is indoctrination, and that indoctrination is antipathetic to rationality.

I am not prone to argue with these theorists or to paraphrase Louis Armstrong and say, "Bless your little pointed heads." For as we shall note, the rigorous social scientists have potentially an enormous contribution to make in helping the university to perform its second role—the role of helping the city to know the things which belong to its peace, the role of predicting the probable consequences of urban decisions. I would only claim that the humanistic traditions of the Western world are the necessary and reasonable province of such university disciplines as history, philosophy, political theory, religion, art, and literature; and that part of the wisdom of the ages involves the social and psychic fall-out of moral callousness. It is not enough to know what produces hell; it is important to accompany Dante and to be confronted with the searing consequences of hell. In the province of human affairs, discomfort is a powerful motivator of science. To cultivate the capacity of the young to be uncomfortable in the presence of bigotry and squalor and disease and ugliness and poverty and ignorance may be the university's major long-run contribution to urban decision-making. For decisions are reflections of value. If we cannot weep at constrictions upon human fulfillment, why harness science to alleviate them?

What are some of these constrictions? What are the major limitations on human freedom which exist in urban America, and upon which urban decisions must increasingly focus?

First, I doubt that a sick person is a free person. The Italian philosopher Croce caught the essence here when he wrote, "When we go to the rescue of a person who is ill, and quiet or lessen his pain, we are striving in effect to restore a source of activity, in other words, a source of freedom to society."

Are urban decisions presently being taken which are adequate to rescue the ill, to quiet or lessen their pain, to restore a source of activity to the society as a whole?

In spite of the fact that projected budgets and trust funds for federally sponsored health activities for this coming fiscal year will exceed ten billion dollars, and that this amount will be thrice matched by state, local, and private outlays, tens of millions of American citizens will still be effectively denied adequate health services. During the Watts riots in Los Angeles, it was reputed that the nearest available hospital was forty minutes away. The nation faces a critical shortage of doctors, dentists, medical technicians, nurses and nursing homes, out-patient clinics, and hospital beds. Our attacks upon the environmental health problems of air and water pollution and of traffic and industrial accidents in our great metropolitan areas have been shockingly inadequate. The petty jurisdictional jealousies which have precluded the effective rationalization of metropolitan health services—jealousies between public and private hospitals; among veterans hospitals, military hospitals, and public and private civilian hospitals; among various health departments of suburban enclaves and between these and the health departments of central cities—represent a shocking and tragic waste. And what about the field of preventive medicine, and the relating of health services to other areas of social pathology? The vital statistics of any city will tell you that slum kids are more prone to disease than suburban kids; that mortality rates are higher; that epidemics spread faster in slums than in non-slums; that venereal disease, drug addiction, and alcoholism—the pathetic evidences of the attempts of the hopeless to escape their worldly environment short of death—are endemic in slum environments.

Are urban decisions presently being made with a view toward the humane and rational distribution of health services? To ask the question is to answer it.

If sickness inhibits freedom by constricting the opportunities for self-fulfillment, so does ignorance. Education is on its way toward becoming by 1970 a sixty-billion-dollar national enterprise. But educational opportunity, especially in our urban configurations, is marked by grim disparities. The federal government alone in 1967 will spend over eight billion dollars in education and training activities, and over a quarter of this amount will be directed toward upgrading educational services for the culturally deprived. These funds will influence educational resource allocation in urban areas, but they will run far short of redressing inequities which annually condemn millions of central city youngsters to stunted intellectual growth, unemployment, and antisocial behavior. Urban decisions which permit obsolete and rat-infested school buildings, inexperienced teachers, and uninspired curricula and facilities to dominate educational practice are perverse "tyrannies over the minds of men," to which Thomas Jefferson once swore eternal hostility. As diminishers of human freedom, these conditions, I submit, warrant tears—the tears of anger.

Apart from the considerations of sickness and ignorance, can the poor, the unemployed, the dependent aged, and the ill-housed be truly free? Do not all of these conditions suggest in themselves a narrowing of options, a sullen cancer on the human spirit, a form of external enslavement?

Are urban decisions presently being made to facilitate a wholesale and coordinated attack upon these enemies of self-fulfillment? Have federal, state, local, and private agencies learned to work with each other in this complex area of social planning? Again, to ask the question is to answer it.

Finally, but of course not finally, is the whole realm of injustice through discrimination. For a sizable group of Americans, the overriding problem of freedom is simple acceptance in the community. How can one be free if one's life is encumbered with the gnawing injustice of being accepted not as an individual, but as a member of a minority group against whom the majority discriminates in a hundred ways? This indignity I have never known for I am white, Protestant, and Anglo-Saxon. I have never experienced directly or indirectly the terrifying psychic insecurity of not knowing how I am going to be treated in a restaurant or a hotel or a real estate office or a college fraternity—or even a church. Neither discriminators nor those discriminated against can ever be free people; the former because they must live in fear of retribution; the latter because they must exist in a series of squalid ghettos—physical and spiritual. A tenth of our population is Negro; this group commits over 50 per cent of the murders in America, 56 per cent of the manslaughters, 53 per cent of the aggravated assaults, 35 per cent of the robberies, 25 per cent of the rapes, 46 per cent of the narcotics offenses, and 41 per cent of the concealed weapons offenses. This is the tragic and pathological fall-out, not of Negro inferiority or depravity, but of our unwillingness to accept Negroes as individuals. We are on their backs and they are on ours. If freedom and welfare are the interdependent goals of urban decision-making, then government cannot possibly escape the duty of moving into this problem with firmness and intelligence and moral clarity. It is the largest threat to man's freedom in this country—Negro and white alike.

It is said that laws cannot change men's hearts. Even if I accept this as true (which I do not), I would counter that laws can change men's overt behavior. A central job is to make men aware of the diminution in their own freedom which discrimination inevitably involves. This responsibility goes far beyond government. All of us have special functions to perform in this civilizing task. But governments do have the task of translating our moral heritage and our political principles into enforceable codes of fair practice, equal rights, and increasingly equal opportunities. To say that the federal civil rights acts of the past three years—and these are essentially urban decisions—have limited the freedom of some citizens to discriminate against other citizens, is equivalent to saying that enforceable laws against murder restrict the freedom of murderers. All secular laws, if they are moral, impose limits upon license in order to create the conditions of civilized behavior. In no field of human experience is there a greater need for positive governmental action reinforced by moral conscience than in the realm of civil rights.

Have we developed a capacity for promoting urban decisions—public and private—which will move toward an orderly and humane solution to racial injustice? Stewart Alsop, among others, has thrown up his hands in despair; he sees decades if not generations of big city ghettos surrounded by white suburbs. If in Flandrin's painting Christ mourned over the city of Paris, he must be weeping convulsively over Watts and Harlem and Hough and forty other metropolitan ghettos which the attorney general of the United States says are ready to blow at any minute.

Sickness, ignorance, squalor, dependency, discrimination—these are the major frontiers of urban decision-making. One of the university's major roles is to say so—by restating our value inheritance, by encouraging volunteer student and staff activity in the life of a city, by inducing tears of outrage at the gap between value premise and social reality.

But tears are not enough. Education is fundamentally a game of truth and the consequences. It involves, in Whitehead's terms, "a search for order and a distrusting of order perceived." Universities can and must contribute directly and indirectly to urban decision-making by the discovery of root laws of human behavior and of the conditions under which such laws operate. The ultimate justification for university research is a fundamental faith that the truth will make us free. In the social and behavioral sciences we sense a great deal, but we know very little. Our propositions about social behavior tend to be gooey concoctions of proverbial wisdom, Freudian analogues, and inoperative mathematical models. To the extent we are saved, we are saved by the intuitive wisdom of leaders rather than by the validity of testable propositions. In such fields as education, welfare, and race relations, we are still groping for a definition of viable, analytical problems. We are not within sniffing distance of scientific answers. We in the universities are being asked with embarrassing frequency to recommend solutions to baffling community issues. In most cases we lack the humility to confess that we do not know —that we lack the tools at the moment even to find out how to begin the process of analysis which ultimately might lead to useful knowledge. Our research is too often pedestrian, discipline-bound, fragmentary, and non-additive.

And yet, in the long run, our major contributions to urban decision-making must be in the very areas of research where presently we are so confused and so inadequate. One wonders what would have happened in the past decade if we had forgotten the moon and plowed all the money for NASA into social and behavioral science research related to the major problems of urban America. Perhaps we would be no farther along than we are now. But I cannot really believe this. And in any case, some modifications in resource allocations might have saved us from the accusation, so eloquently phrased by Tom Hughes, that "the rich explore the heavens while the poor inherit the earth."

I know that government agencies and the large foundations get impatient with the preciousness and irrelevancy of much university research. But it is possible that they have become impatient too soon. We need more help not less for our game of truth and consequences. We need both to support and to protect our ablest social scientists from hard, cold empiricism and analysis. Only thus can the probabilities of science ultimately be fused with the sensitivities of leadership to produce a truly benevolent rationality in the solution of intractable problems of human organization and behavior.

But even if we started tomorrow with adequate support, the development of useful social science would be attenuated and incremental. In the meantime, are there more immediate even if less exalted intellectual roles for the universities to play in urban decision-making? I think there are. This is not to say that all universities in the country have the staff, resources, or inclination to play every role that can be identified. Universities have quite as much right as individuals to be inner-directed. Every institution of higher learning in America has its own discrete style, capacity, and history. That Harvard has not played the same role in metropolitan Boston that Wayne State has played in metropolitan Detroit may be cause for rejoicing rather than for invidious comparisons. But long-term science aside, universities can have an important effect upon urban decision-making in at least three ways: they can provide specialized, technical advice; they can help educate urban decision-makers; and, above all, they can induce the dreams which will inspire creative thought about solving problems.

Universities may provide specialized, technical advice in a number of ways. There are few universities which do not have scores of faculty who, vocationally or avocationally, are interested in the applied and engineering aspects of their fields. An engineering school can undertake feasibility studies concerning the technical success of an urban project; organic and analytical chemists can help in identifying the precise nature of air and water pollution; business schools can help tidy up public accountancy or give advice on the use of computers for handling payrolls;

library schools can help city fathers or school superintendents develop plans for new municipal or school libraries; schools of public administration can help explain the pitfalls as well as the utilities of program-budgeting; art, drama, and music schools can give advice on a variety of cultural fronts; schools of architecture can give technical advice in city planning and municipal building design; university bureaus of governmental research can collect and disseminate the results of operating experiments in a wide variety of municipal functions; law schools can become important sources of information about comparative state and municipal law and can help in ordinance-drafting and charter revisions; schools of public health can perform laboratory functions and can serve as consultants on crisis as well as long-range problems of epidemiology. The list is almost endless. And if one were able to make a thoroughgoing tabulation of present services of this kind being rendered to the municipalities of America by neighboring universities, the results would be as impressive as they are heartening. Even so there is much more that universities can and should do to help urban decision-makers—with feasibility studies and with technical advice of all kinds in a wide variety of professional and technical fields.

The second role of the university is pre-entry and mid-career education and training for urban decision-makers. Urban governments in America are faced with a serious manpower crisis—quantitatively and qualitatively. There is an insufficient number of university students preparing for urban careers; there are inadequate provisions for upgrading, through in-service educational opportunities, the capacities of those presently charged with urban decision-making in both the public and private sectors.

On the pre-entry question, I had reason this past summer to address a statement to Senator Edmund S. Muskie in connection with hearings on his pending bill for improving state and local government personnel. In part I said this:

> Unless state and local governments receive a continuing stream of highly educated and well-trained young people, no amount of post-entry training by either short-term or long-term courses will make any appreciable dent or sense. In the nation's self-interest, I would propose undergraduate and graduate "loan fellowships" on the NDEA pattern for teachers—financed by the federal government and awarded on a competitive basis—for students who indicate their willingness to spend at least five years after graduation in state or local government service. These "loan fellowships" should be available regard-

less of academic discipline or major or pre-professional concentration, since modern governments need every skill universities can provide. For every two years of actual public service, one year of the loan would be forgiven. The funding for this program should be liberal enough to cover at least 10,000 college and university students each year. This figure represents only 1% of existing state and local public service employment. Such a program would take an annual appropriation of between 40-50 million dollars. If such a "loan fellowship" scheme (or alternate schemes involving work-study or internship programs for students) is to succeed, of course, it must be accompanied by changed salary incentives and new career development programs at the state and local level, and by imaginative and positive recruiting efforts by state and local government in the colleges and the universities of the nation. But support for inducing a quantity of young people to enter state and local public service seems to me the sine qua non of solving the manpower questions you, as a senator, have so appropriately raised.

In the field of mid-career training, universities have an unprecedented opportunity and responsibility. University College at Syracuse, in cooperation with the Maxwell School and the various other professional schools of the university, has created a Center for Continuing Education in the Public Service. One of the center's major functions is to develop short-term and long-term courses of special value to urban decision-makers who need to recharge their intellectual batteries, to have their minds stretched and complicated, to be upgraded in the rapidly changing technologies of urban services and management, to prepare themselves for top executive and policy responsibilities so that they can thread their way successfully through the present maze of intergovernmental, interagency, and interprogram relationships.

Syracuse is not unique in this expanding field. And in any case, we and our sister universities have hardly scratched the surface of opportunity and need in the whole area of mid-career education and training for urban decision-makers. Perhaps as a result of the Ford Foundation supported studies of the National Institute of Public Affairs into possible designs for mid-career education for state and local decision-makers, new experiments will be stimulated and funded.

There is no point in bewailing the possibility that these extension services (or the technical or consulting services mentioned above) can subvert the major business of universities—"major business" being defined as undergraduate and graduate education and basic research. Of course these more traditional roles can be corrupted. But that is why universities have chancellors, provosts, and deans—to influence the allocation of resources so that a balance is maintained among the competing services and functions that the modern university is called upon to perform. Furthermore, I have great faith in the conservative power of disciplinary and professional interests in academia to withstand the onslaughts of less prestigious claims upon the attention of university staffs. My fear, actually, is quite the other way—that the university will be too timid, too slow, too negative in responding to the more immediate needs of our urban society; that our disciplines and professions will be too ingrown, too precious, and too protective to make them truly relevant to the complex and dangerous world of the urban decision-maker. And we should be aware that if we have something to say to the urban decision-maker, he also has a great deal to say to us. Mid-career education, like municipal consultancies, if properly structured, can provide for the university exciting and valuable windows to reality. Science is not empiricism; but it is rooted in empiricism. And structured interaction patterns between universities and urban decision-makers can increase the flow of empirical data and insight between the practitioner and the professor.

I have left to the last the most important role of the university vis-à-vis urban decision-making. In one sense this final point is redundant, for it is simply another way of emphasizing what I said at the very beginning. I began with a claim that tears could motivate science. I end with a proposition that, far more important than motivating science, tears can induce dreams; dreams about a tearless world—"patriot dreams that see beyond the years thine alabaster cities gleam undimmed by human tears."

Surely no responsibility of the university is more fundamental. Science—including social science—is an instrument. It cannot define the goals of good or great societies. It cannot conjure Augustinian cities of God or even the Heavenly City of the eighteenth-century philosophers. There is no mathematical model for justice, no in-put—out-put analysis for beauty, no computer print-offs for the full and rich life. I suppose, as Robert Boguslaw has pointed out, that systems analysts will try to build utopias; but, as he also points out, they will in the process make all of the fundamental errors of the traditional utopians. The job of universities is not to construct utopian blueprints which cannot work, or which turn out to be hideously contra-productive to values initially posited. The job of the university is to dream dreams and to inspire creative thought about resolving specific problems—problems which patently interfere with the pursuit of happiness for millions of people. It is not utopian to dream of a world in which physical illness and pain are reduced, in which people are housed attractively in an environment which promotes rather than inhibits joy, in which opportunities for self-fulfillment are made more equal, in which artistic and intellectual satisfactions are increased, in which the energy and diversity and options of urban life are not short-circuited by injustice and disorder, in which the stars are not obliterated by smog and the song of the birds is not overpowered by the claxons of technology. These are attainable dreams. It is the business of universities to keep these dreams alive, and to give students a sense of their attainability.

Modern secular man has lost most of his faith in the power and reality of theology. But if "God is Dead," man is alive, and part of man is an insistent voice that says, "What I see and experience is not good enough." In an earlier age, we would have looked at the destructive storms of urban life and attributed them to the chastening power of an Almighty. In the words of the hymn writer:

> His chariots of wrath the deep thunderclouds form
> And darken his path on the wings of the storm.

Today, social storms have secular origins and secular meanings. Their effects must be mediated less by prayer than by the scientific seeding of dark clouds. If the universities can keep alive the goals of truth, beauty, and goodness, who can doubt that man's reason will ultimately find answers to the proximate storms which threaten him in his increasingly urban settings?

Then, perhaps, in some distant time and place our children's children can come into an unalienated relationship with their universe, and sing without fear, superstition, or irony, the next stanza of the hymn:

> Thy bountiful care what tongue can recite?
> It breathes in the air, it shines in the light,
> It streams from the hills, it descends to the plain,
> And sweetly distills in the dew and the rain;

URBAN INSTITUTIONS AS UNIVERSITY CLIENTS

by

Sanford L. Kravitz

Kravitz discusses the ways in which the university can and must help the city solve its problems. He sees the two major needs of urban institutions as a manpower shortage and a knowledge problem. The university must mobilize its resources rapidly and responsibly not only to increase the number of workers available but to improve the quality and efficiency of these people. It must redefine job content, training, roles, and job status, reevaluate current notions about professionalism, and give attention to the increasing use of sub-professionals. In regard to the knowledge problem, the university must emphasize the application of knowledge to the improvement of society and work toward creative innovation, seeking new ways to relate its resources to community needs. It must also seek a common language to bridge the gap between the administrator's concern for immediate answers to specific problems and the scholar's concern for theory and research.

Sanford L. Kravitz is on the staff of the Florence Heller School at Brandeis University. Previously, he was at the Office of Economic Opportunity as director of one of its bureaus. He has also served on the President's Task Force on the War Against Poverty and the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime and has been active in local and state welfare councils.

URBAN INSTITUTIONS AS UNIVERSITY CLIENTS

This past summer, the summer of 1966, has been one of crisis and tension in almost every large urban area of the nation and in a number of suburban areas. News broadcasts have been split between the violence in Vietnam and the real or anticipated violence at home. To say that we have desperately serious problems in the city is already a well-worn cliché. The Ribicoff hearings in August pounded home the desperation of mayors on the one hand and of the residents of slums on the other, with each often looking past the other. The city is desperately in need of help —help from wherever it can come. The mayors put the solutions in terms of cash and used figures that most citizens have come to associate with war. Thus there was a distinct air of unreality to Mayor Lindsay's fifty billion dollars. But in the lengthy recital of the woes of the city little was said of the two major dimensions of the problem: the manpower problem, and the problem of knowing what to do—the knowledge problem.

It is precisely in these two areas that the university must be called upon to make its major contribution to urban needs. It is in these two areas that urban institutions must seek help from universities. The university is the only major resource we presently have for this assistance. If it is not forthcoming, alternative resources will have to be developed, and that will take precious time. We have too little time to spare.

The Manpower Problem

The theme of a manpower crisis may be familiar to university officials involved in the business of training, but it is virtually absent from the discussions on the problems of the city. Yet the scope of the manpower crisis in relation to the city is vast.

In one of our largest cities, with extensive training resources and ample poverty funds allocated for the purpose, the development of an elaborate scheme of neighborhood service centers has been retarded for almost a year because of the lack of trained professional and sub-professional personnel.

After an exhaustive effort to organize over eight hundred community action agencies in the short period of about twenty months, the Office of Economic Opportunity encountered serious program delays because of shortages in program-planning skills and personnel to man the programs.

Within the OEO staff, face-to-face consultation with communities and program communication have been retarded, in large measure due to the shortages of professional personnel with the skill, understanding, or substantive knowledge to engage in creative program review and development.

The challenge has, in small part, been met by OEO with packaged national programs. Each of these has had its team of trained consultants, e.g., Legal Services, Head Start, Upward Bound, Foster Grandparents, Teacher-Aide Training, and Home Health Aides. In large measure, carefully constructed guidelines and pre-filed applications have had to substitute for knowledge, experience, training, imagination, and genuine local program development.

The manpower crisis is not just an OEO problem but a Great Society problem. With any lessening of the war pressure in Vietnam, the Johnson administration is committed to new programs for people and for cities, committed for more reasons than idealism. Our predictable population growth, the predictable, sustained rise in our gross national product, which will be returning substantial funds to the federal coffers, the rising expectations of the poor, the increasing impact of problems of the cities —all these will force a continued increase in programs in education, social welfare, housing, health, and manpower training. The planners of most of these programs show little concern for the manpower which will staff them. There is a tacit assumption on the part of program developers, administrators, and educators that the free market will respond to any of our personnel needs. The universities in particular have not responded to the manpower crisis.

Herman Niebuhr recently noted that:

1. The public employment service still does not have a pre-service educational system;
2. The public welfare system has the illusion of a pre-service educational system in the network of social work schools; the bulk of the work is done by people educated for something else;
3. The mental health system has a highly professionalized pre-service educational mechanism, but it is highly class oriented. Relevant service to the poor is really provided by those untrained non-professionals called "aides" in the mental hospitals;

4. The educational system is the only one of all the service professions that has a well-established pre-service educational system in the network of colleges of education. Although the system produces almost enough persons, the level of training is, to a large degree, totally inadequate to the hard-core needs of the society.[1]

It is certain that for the next score of years this nation will face serious manpower shortages that will plague our efforts to implement community-sanctioned and legislatively approved human services programs. A manpower shortage of major national scope exists now, shielded like an iceberg from public view or substantial legislative concern.

It is both predictable and discouraging to note that the negative impact of the manpower problem falls unevenly on the backs of the very poor. When services are available, they are the last to receive benefits. When faced with ineffective, poorly trained, harsh, punitive professionals or sub-professionals, they are the least able to cope, to negotiate the service systems, to get their fair share of understaffed programs. One of the major achievements of the poverty program has been to focus national attention on the very poor. Much of the momentum of this concern will be dissipated unless we can deliver, and we can't deliver without people.

Clearly one of the issues for the universities committed to improving community action and alleviating the manpower shortage is how they can mobilize their training resources rapidly and responsibly. They must ask themselves what the sources of manpower are and how these sources and resources can be brought together.

They must also address themselves to the second part of the manpower problem (the part which has received even less attention)—the fact that more people alone will not suffice. They must undertake a serious, intensive, long-range effort at redefinition of jobs and roles and, of course, job status. Most of our existing training programs have been aimed at the sheer need for producing more. Little if any attention has been devoted to "more for what."

---

1. Herman Niebuhr, Training as an Agent of Institutional Change (Philadelphia: Center for Community Studies, Temple University, July, 1966, mimeo).

The Office of Economic Opportunity has made and is making a historic contribution to the human services manpower issue by opening up and aggressively supporting the sub-professional concept. ("Sub-professionals" here are those workers in an agency who come from among the poor of the community served by the agency.) Support for the employment of sub-professionals is, however, only the opening wedge. Insufficient attention has been given by the funding agencies, the training agencies, and the program managers to the drastic need for job redefinition and the development of relevant training which must accompany such redefinition. In the past most local community action agencies merely established some artificial ratio of professional to sub-professional and proceeded to create jobs for the poor or near poor.

Job redefinition does not happen overnight. It requires breaking down of highly charged professional protectionist attitudes. It calls for careful study of tasks. Fortunately, there is an emerging experience being hammered out in thousands of local community projects. It is an experience that must be closely examined by institutions engaged in the task of training people for human services.

Much of what we need to do in human services training is beyond the experience of our present training resources. The human services professions tend to operate anachronistically, repeating their previous performances in an unsolicited encore. This pattern must be checked if we are to save lives and money and drastically improve our present performance.

Training institutions face the task of continuing to train people for what must be done now and simultaneously assessing the new job requirements, changing both tasks and training as they do so. Universities engaged in preparing personnel for urban institutions must assume responsibility for and insist on the necessity for re-evaluation of the roles different levels of staff must play. For example, instead of asking which professional functions a sub-professional can fulfill, they must first validate the function and the relevance of professional skills.

While training institutions gather knowledge and experience and engage in research in the task of training for human services, they must also pay attention to the goals and philosophy of the programs for which training is undertaken. There is no magic, for instance, in training sub-professionals for a program in which the attitude of the professionals remains unchanged and program policies are unaltered.

As the notion of increasing use of sub-professionals grows, the dangers inherent in undisciplined assignment without training multiply. The danger of "locking in" at the menial, the trivial, the unimaginative task level is most critical. With the availability of hundreds of millions of dollars for sub-professional employment in the next year or two, pressures on training institutions will be enormous.

As universities move into this field of training, we note several contradictory notions at large. One is the idea that sub-professionals are better than professionals for any task. This position holds that there are advantages and understandings which come from being poor that overcome any advantages of professional training or advanced degrees. On the other hand there is also the theme that the sub-professional is essentially a hewer of wood and a drawer of water and serves primarily as a handmaiden or aide to the professional.

Current images, attitudes, and definitions of professional and sub-professional roles appear to reinforce the widely held popular image of the poor, the continuing belief that the poor make their own poverty. This will not change unless we can effect basic changes in American attitudes about occupational prestige. It is a major challenge to universities engaged in training to support the concept that working with and for human beings regardless of accompanying formal degrees is a role with significant status in our society.

Such an idea has many ramifications. Not only does it ascribe prestige to human service positions in the eyes of the community at large, but it establishes in the value system of the poor the high status role of human services. There follows from this goal the importance of full-scale involvement of the poor themselves as active participants in recruitment, training, and supervision. Thus, training institutions will have to undertake the use of sub-professionals as part of the training program staff.

It is a matter of serious concern that as critical as our human services manpower question is, so little has been written, so little job analysis has been undertaken, so few training materials exist, and so little has been done to capture the interest and imagination of the educational institutions of this country in doing much more than business as usual.

Hundreds of millions of dollars will be available in the next several years for the employment of new personnel in the many areas of human services. Think of the possibilities which would exist if we were to focus the concerted attention of community agencies and educational institutions on the task of training for human services. Visualize a situation in which a real training and job development partnership existed between community and educational institutions.

The task calls for attention to job redefinition, job content, clarification of professional and sub-professional roles, changing of attitudes, concern for job mobility, performance measurement, revision of current ideas about the mix of training and experience. None of these issues can be ignored by those for whom training will be more than offering a few selected courses in conventional wisdom. Because of the scope of the problem and its complexity, the manpower question and the accompanying training issues must be viewed as the most urgent entry point for educational institutions into the field of urban needs.

The Knowledge Problem

There is no shortage of suggestions for solutions to urban problems. Ideas range from revisions of governmental structure to increased participation of the poor to complete federal withdrawal from urban problems. One issue is clear: We face an increasing escalation in problems as urban life becomes more complicated. The urgency of these problems requires the increased assumption of responsibility by universities for rapidly increasing our knowledge of urban life and urban problems. Public and private organizations—housing and redevelopment authorities, civic associations, planning commissions, social agencies, religious institutions, and industrial corporations—are becoming increasingly aware of the difficulties in solving many of their own problems without reference to the total fabric of urban life. The universities are in a better position to view urban problems objectively and with foresight and to place specific problems in their more general context.

One of the critical problems is the difficulty that civic officials have in stating their problems and their needs to universities in research terms. There is a continuing need to redefine the research function of the university in applied terms. The practitioner, the operator, the administrator has little or no interest in theory or traditional scholarship. The methods of experimentation, control testing, and rejection are peculiarly suitable to the academic atmosphere. The scholar hopes to conduct his studies free of political pressures. The administrator, the policy maker, is impatient and annoyed when ready solutions are not forthcoming.

Time and the protective mantle of ivy are with the scholar, but retreat into "scholarship" can also be an alienating force. What is needed is the perspective and balance that can protect true scholarship but also be sympathetic and responsive to the urgent pressures on the administrator. What the administrator does not need is "wise guy" criticism.

The "massive breakthrough in the field of urban research is still to come. 'One urban slingshot or single urban stone . . . regardless of the hurler or the accuracy of the stone's trajectory' will not fully or finally dispose of the matter."[2]

The city is remarkably complex; it defies definition. It has different meanings for different people. The businessman, the wage earner, the shopkeeper, the politician, the slumdweller—all begin from different premises. Goals are not necessarily shared by the sub-groups which comprise the community.[3] If we are to solve the myriad problems that we presently face, new insights are needed, greater understanding must be achieved of the enormous complexity that is today's urban scene.

The university has the responsibility of making the knowledge its scholars possess and acquire available to the community so that it may be applied to the improvement of urban life. The traditional functions of the university—teaching and research—must now be extended to the application of knowledge to the improvement of society.[4]

There is no more urgent area of concern for universities than that of dealing with the problems of poverty. Yet universities have only just begun to define their responsibilities to the poor. The characteristic image of the university based rural extension program, as a case in point, is that of serving the middle-class farmer. For all practical purposes the poverty-stricken have yet to feel the impact of the university outreach. "The university's visibility in the inner core is blurred, while the wide experience of its personnel in dealing with other community problems is often unrealistic in dealing with slum conditions."[5]

---

[2] J. Martin Klotsche, The Urban University (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 48. Internal quotation from Ben West.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., pp. 49-50.

The university has a host of new opportunities to pioneer with fresh, innovative, experimental approaches to urban problems.

> Creative innovation, rather than performing routine urban services, is the vital role of the university. It should "devote its energies to what might be described as the frontier of urban extension, exploring and testing new ways of relating its intellectual resources to the need of the community for urban knowledge. As it moves into new frontiers it should seek to leave along the way trained persons, institutional arrangements, and habits of mind—especially among urban decision makers at all levels—that will so function as to enable it in good conscience to disengage its resources from established or repetitive operations and reinvest them in exploration. Thus the university can contribute continuously to the strengthening of the urban society and to the maintenance of its own vigor and integrity as a center and source of knowledge."[6]

Outstanding examples of universities fulfilling this role are occurring in the demonstration and research program under the Economic Opportunity Act. In the field of health and medical services, Tufts University School of Medicine has undertaken a pioneering effort in the delivery of comprehensive medical care to the six thousand residents of the Columbia Point Housing Project in Boston. Breaking with the traditional methods for delivery of medical care to the poor, the medical school began with concern for quality and dignity of service and has in ten months built a program that is already a national model for the provision of good medical care to the poor. It has done this with imaginative involvement of the inhabitants themselves in the policy direction of the program. The University of Southern California School of Medicine is undertaking a similar program on a much larger scale in Watts.

The emerging field of legal services to the poor has captured the interest of a number of law schools. First on the scene was the University of Detroit, which made an institutional commitment to specialize in urban law. It has organized several neighborhood law firms manned by full-time staff as well as law student interns and is publishing a journal of urban law based largely on the research findings of this effort.

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 53-54.

[6] Ibid., pp. 55-56. Internal quotation from John Bebout.

OEO has found that many professional schools were quite prepared to "buck the establishment" in the development of new service forms. In this context it is well to remember Abraham Flexner's comments on the demands made on the university. "A university should not be a weather vane, responsive to every variation of popular whim. Universities must at all times give society, not what society wants but what it needs."[7] What society needs may not be what is always in the self-interest of the university, if that view is taken too narrowly.

This raises the issue of the definition of the "client" relationship and the special problems which accompany such relationships. One dictionary definition of a client is "one who consults a specialist for advice and aid." An alternative definition is "customer or patron." The patterns of the past indicate that all too often this "client" relationship has had either a noblesse oblige quality or the quality of the relationship of a laboratory technician to his experimental rabbits.

Programs which have brought the university into the heart of the city all too often lack the deep commitment of those directly involved. Frequently the senior university officials are sunshine patriots retreating in face of strong winds. There are notable exceptions to this, and the willingness of Syracuse University to stay with the much-discussed Syracuse Community Development and Training Project is one.

But the pressures of community and trustees to stay out of controversial areas cannot be overlooked. Community involvement must imply a pretty top-level commitment to stick out the consequences of a particular civic endeavor. It is equally important that civic officials and community groups gain a better understanding of the facts of life which govern university participation in civic affairs. Most politicians and public administrators along with neighborhood leadership are suspicious of intellectuals and university types. Careful attention must be paid to delineation of relationships. Some of the suspicions held by the "townies" are well founded. Unfortunately, it is the rare university administration that has set out to establish well-ordered relationships with community groups. The freedom to apply for research grants and demonstration projects with the community has often been accompanied by a distant disinterest or self-interest on the part of administration.

---

[7] Abraham Flexner, Universities—American, English, German (New York, 1930), pp. 5-6.

It is the self-interest image that is so damaging to relationships with the locals and with government administrators. All too often federal officials and local skeptics view university participation in terms of 20 per cent of total budget in indirect costs of 46 per cent of salaries or what a top government official called "university profit." I offer no solid solution to this problem other than to urge university officials to keep a watchful eye on their comptrollers or government finance officers to assure that the federal research and demonstration funds are not supporting a host of other university functions.

Participation in community life and the symbiotic development of the community and its institutions is clearly part of the cost of running a university and the development of such relationships should not necessarily have to be preceded by contract negotiations. Participation in any depth in the community requires the fullest and highest level of commitment from administration.

To the challenge of space and the challenge of resolving our international problems, the challenge of civilizing our cities must be added as a major task for this century. It will be an unattainable goal unless the resources of our universities can respond quickly, appropriately, and with dedication.

POLITICS OF UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL CHANGE

by

Alan K. Campbell

Campbell discusses the university's role in social change from the political viewpoint. By examining our political system as it relates to university involvement, he indicates the political ramifications of such involvement and shows the kind of involvement that is politically possible. He pinpoints the difficulties civic administrators and university personnel have in working together as problems of approach: universities tend to define problems within their more general context and to espouse long-range planning, while our political system is primarily conducive to small incremental change and short-range planning. This political bias exists because of (1) our lack of knowledge about the causes and consequences of change; (2) our ideological environment, which is based in good part on laissez faire; (3) our power structure, which is pluralistic; and (4) our decision-making process. Although the system in some ways agrees with the university, it also produces many frustrations. These frustrations are an inevitable part of the system; university involvement is nonetheless necessary and must continue.

Alan K. Campbell is Professor of Political Science and Director of the Metropolitan Studies Program of the Maxwell Graduate School at Syracuse University. He has served as Deputy Comptroller for Administration in the State of New York and consultant to the State Commission on the Governmental Operations of the City of New York. Dr. Campbell is currently a member of a commission to simplify the state constitution.

POLITICS OF UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL CHANGE

The Concept of University Involvement

This paper deals with three broad subjects: politics, universities, and social change. Because it is impossible to discuss these topics with any kind of completeness here, I shall deal with them only within a limited framework.

The concept of university involvement will be defined and related to what political scientists think they know about social change. Consequently it should be possible to indicate the political ramifications of such involvement and thereby the kind of involvement which is politically possible.

To understand university involvement requires a knowledge of the many and various roles a university plays in modern society. All institutions in contemporary society are complex, but perhaps the most complex are universities. There are many ways in which parts of a university or university personnel may be involved in social change. To help clarify the kind of university involvement I am discussing, I shall first indicate the types with which I am not concerned.

A university administration, for example, has a stake in the ongoing social system since the institution it administers is a part of that system. It will be concerned with such local government matters as zoning and building-code enforcement, with such national matters as legislation that provides financial aid to institutions, and with a variety of state bodies that have power relative to the university. In these situations the administration acts like any other interest group. It defines and tries to protect institutional stakes. In doing so it may have the support of its faculty and students, but this role is only incidental to promoting social change and, therefore, is not of concern here.

Similarly, individual faculty members may become involved in promoting social change in ways which are only peripheral to their institutional affiliation. As scholars and teachers they may exert considerable influence on public thinking, and as participants in community and political affairs they may play a significant public role. They do this, however, not as representatives of their institutions but as experts in a particular field. The direction of the social change which these activities promote is not necessarily consistent with the direction desired by the university administration. Nevertheless, although the administration may attempt to limit faculty activities, it cannot enforce institutional loyalty. This independent role of the scholar in promoting social change, albeit important, does not fit the concept of university involvement used here.

Like the administration or the faculty, the student body may also attempt to bring about social change. The participation of a large number of students in the Civil Rights movement, for example, has certainly played an important role in the momentous social changes which that movement has accomplished. Such student involvement, however, is not university-sponsored and only indirectly university-inspired.

The kind of university involvement with which I am concerned is that which grows out of the mobilization of some part of the university's resources to attack a social problem. The techniques which may be used to accomplish this mobilization include sponsored research, training programs, and demonstration projects. Financing may be internal or external. Nearly all such activities require some form of administrative approval of the project and therefore involve some degree of institutional commitment. But such a commitment does not include any implication of university approval of the findings. The public finds this aspect of university involvement particularly difficult to understand. Although reports and other products of such activities carry the university name, they do not involve university approval. The relationship is a complex one and leads to many problems, some of which are discussed below.

It is within the context of this type of university involvement that one must analyze the politics of university involvement in social change. The issues revolve around the extent to which the university can be effective in its social change role and the consequences such a role carries for the university. In order to examine both effectiveness and consequences, it is necessary to understand something about social change itself. The process of change must also be understood if the decision points in the system are to be effectively identified and manipulated.

The Nature of Social Change

For the student of social behavior, an analysis of social change requires, first, an understanding of change. It is impossible to plan change or, more realistically, to direct and control it, if the process and determinants of change are not understood.

Although the understanding of change is a central concern of every social scientist, no generally accepted theoretical social system has successfully incorporated change determinants. Most of us are still trying to understand the relationships and interactions of variables in a static system. There is, in fact, a question whether change can be incorporated into a social system model since change implies a new or different set of relationships which upset the model, or which at least cause it to alter direction or move to another level of performance.

The difficulty lies in predicting the impact of change on all the interrelated variables which constitute the system. Such theoretical difficulties do not stand in the way of interpreting the causes and consequences of change after it has occurred. The problem lies in understanding the dynamics of change sufficiently to permit effective participation in the process and to understand the political consequences of that participation.

The problem of dealing with change is related not only to the inherent problems in theory-model-building but to the concept of change as well. It is not very satisfactory or useful to discuss change in general or abstract terms. Its possible meanings are too numerous and the range in degree of change too wide to make it a sufficiently precise concept for analytical purposes.

Obviously changes can differ in depth and in speed. At one extreme is the transformation of society, the tearing up of a social order by its roots, a change accompanied by disorder and violence—a revolution. Even revolutions, however, differ. The American Revolution brought great political change but did not fundamentally alter the country's social and economic system, while the Russian Revolution brought basic changes to all aspects of that society.

At the other end of the change continuum is the kind of change which does not disrupt society, but which alters its course by some degree. In the short run such change may appear slight, but in the long run it can bring about fundamental alterations in society. For example, the adoption of government guarantees of housing mortgages in the 1930's was not considered by many as fundamentally altering any aspect of American society; but this policy certainly aided, even if it did not cause, the suburbanization of America in the 1950's. On the other hand, other efforts to bring about more basic changes or to control changes considered undesirable have had little or no impact.

It is, perhaps, of some interest that the kinds of changes which have produced the more general theories have been the drastic changes, the revolutionary alterations in societal structure. These theories have not been the product of the contemporary political scientist, economist, or sociologist, but of the more grandiose social scientists and historians. From the historians we have the cyclical theory of Vico, the inevitable decline theory of Spengler, and the single factor causative theory of Toynbee; from the general social scientist we have, most notably, the revolutionary doctrine of Marx and the gradual but inevitable progress concept of Condorcet.

These broad sweeping generalizations about the causes of change meet with little favor today. The contemporary social scientist finds them insufficiently supported by empirically based evidence. Concerned with the reliability and validity of his findings, the contemporary social scientist is struggling to discover and apply new techniques of research and analysis. The result is investigations of social phenomena that are based on careful observations, full and accurate collection of data, detailed classification, and a cautious statement of findings. Such self-imposed methodological limitations narrow substantially the range of behavior which can be subject to analysis.

But even these limitations are not considered sufficient by some scholars, usually called the behavioralists. In describing the view of this group in a United Nations publication on the study of the teaching of political science in the United States, Dwight Waldo explains: "They are devoted to a very strict interpretation of the meaning of science. The focus of their attention is sharply on 'what can be observed'—the behavior of humans. The distinguishing or characteristic features of the behavioral approach are: an attempt to avoid all 'oughts,' care in the formulation of hypotheses, preoccupation with fashioning analytical 'models', meticulous attention for leaving a trail that can be followed—'replication'—and caution in conclusions drawn from particular studies together with the expectation of an every growing body of established generalizations."

Some social scientists would argue that these methodological limitations are too strict, that they stand in the way of the analysis and examination of many quite legitimate areas of interest. Methodology, they argue, becomes the criterion for selection of areas of study rather than the relevance and importance of questions and issues on which the social scientist wishes to shed light.

It is not my intention to become embroiled in this dispute, but rather to offer it as at least a partial explanation of why most modern-day social scientists do not spend their time spinning out grandiose theories of change—such theories simply do not meet the criteria of science followed even by the "soft" scientists within the profession. I offer this background, too, to provide at least part of the general context in which the modern-day social scientist studies the dynamics of change and the political possibility of directing, controlling, or planning that change.

The state of knowledge concerning the dynamics of social change has important implications for university involvement in such change. Since it is but imperfectly understood, efforts to promote change may produce unintended consequences. These consequences may not serve the university's interest. If the changes which emerge or are advocated were always predictable, it would obviously be easier for university officials to decide whether the university should become involved.

It is clear that all universities as institutions have a sufficient stake in society so that they will not become involved in promoting revolutionary change. Again, individual faculty members and even organized faculty groups, as well as individual students and organized student groups, may become involved in accomplishing such change. But not the university as an institution.

Therefore it is necessary, in discussing university involvement, to examine what is known about less grandiose change—incremental change. Perhaps in this field the social scientist can provide some help in understanding the politics of university involvement. Analyses of how the political process works, how political power is distributed, and how political decisions are made all provide hints and illustrations relevant to understanding incremental change. Are the institutions, processes, and power ingredients of this system likely to aid or hinder university involvement in such change? To answer this question I will examine the relevance to social change of ideological environment, the power structure and the decision process of American government and politics. In this context social change involves planning, since involvement in social change carries with it the implication of planning such change.

The Ideological Environment for Social Change

In an earlier period the political scientist participated in the great debate in the Western world about whether, in fact, social planning was consistent with a liberal democratic society. In historical terms planning as an issue is a modern phenomenon. It would not have occurred to Aristotle, perhaps the first political scientist, to have questioned the right of government to plan. Rather, he saw the state as the chief means for the realization of the good life. The state was all-inclusive. It was made up of a pattern of institutions which included the family, village, town, and state. It was through the state that ethics were derived and human life was given meaning. As a part of the state, institutions of learning had the obligations to improve the state.

The development of Western civilizations tended to relegate the state and universities to a much narrower sphere. In fact, liberty and freedom were primarily thought of as freedom from state control. There also developed a positive concept of non-interference by the state in the economic field based on the doctrine of laissez faire and the guidance of the economy by an invisible hand. A guidance which worked for the benefit of all, if left alone.

In no country was the doctrine of laissez faire accepted as wholeheartedly as it was in the United States. As Louis Hartz so well explained, neither the paternalism of the Tory nor the noblesse oblige of the upper class had an appreciable impact on American thought or practice. With no feudal system to overthrow, Americans did not carry any fundamental class division into modern society—there was no class and few institutional walls in the way of the full development of liberal institutions and practices. This combination of factors prevented the development of an ideological base in favor of planning social change. This lack of an ideological base for social planning affected all institutions in society including universities. Planning was rejected in America as being inconsistent with the liberal concept of the proper relation between citizen and state. No political party in this country has ever made planning a central doctrine in its platform. Nor have those minor parties which have espoused planning been able to gain the status of major parties.

Despite the ideological rejection of planning, its practice has become increasingly important in the public sector of the American economy. This planning is pragmatically rather than ideologically oriented and has developed in response to the social and economic problems produced by industrialization, economic cycles, urbanization, and the closing of the frontier. Such problems have led to political demands for reform but these reforms were not necessarily consistent with each other. There were at least three different approaches to reform. One of these, demanding simply that laissez faire be made to work, resulted in legislation primarily in the field of anti-trust. Another demanded political reform, and out of this demand grew the primary, the referendum, the initiative and reorganization of the executive branches of state and local government. Finally, the third approach insisted that the state should play a more positive role in the solving of social problems.

Therefore planning has come to play a role (although not a comprehensive one) in the public sector of the economy. It is usually a response to specific problems brought about by change rather than an effort to accomplish change.

In general, the ideological environment for planning is not hostile, but is not positively favorable either. Planning in the abstract has little support, but in concrete problem areas is readily accepted. This ideological environment surrounding the planning of social change has at least two important implications for university involvement. The first relates to the kind of assistance sought by institutions outside of the university: governments and foundations, for example. Operating in a pragmatic, problem-oriented society, the external groups will come to the university for help in solving specific problems. The problems are defined by the external agencies and not by the university. But these are not necessarily the problems which the experts on the university faculty think are important; consequently difficulties in external relations often result. Many mayors, city councilmen, and state legislators, as well as federal bureaucrats, are often irritated by the refusal of university experts to provide assistance. In many instances they are even more irritated when it is suggested that they should pay for such help.

The second implication of the ideological environment relates to the kind of assistance offered by the university. Universities may engage in research and publish findings which grow out of activities sponsored by agencies other than those to whom the advice is directed. A foundation, for example, may sponsor research about the problems of providing educational services to central-city children. Out of such research may come findings that have great relevance for the educational policies being followed by central-city school boards. The response of such boards is not necessarily one of appreciation. Rather, it is considered interference and often condemned on the grounds that it comes from people who do not really understand the problems.

These various kinds of responses to the university involvement are, in part, related to the fact that we have no built-in bias in our system in favor of planning social change. The feeling is that problems should be solved but that there should be no general attack leading to widespread use of public power for the sake of long-range social planning. Yet the kind of activity in which the universities engage is often directly related to that kind of long-term concern. Those in power often respond negatively. Their positions are threatened, their decisions challenged. Most important of all, the source of the advice is impossible to control.

Because it is, in the last analysis, those in power who must be influenced if social change is to be affected, it becomes necessary to analyze what we know about the nature of power and the characteristics of the holders of that power. For if the universities are to be effective, it is these institutions and individuals who must be influenced.

Political Institutions, Power Structure, and Planning Change

Trying to determine who, in fact, governs has become a central emphasis in modern-day political science. The issue has been investigated at all levels of government and in terms of both formal and informal governing systems. At the institutional level it is quite clear that power in American government is divided and characterized by a multitude of institutional checks. The division of power among the branches of government at all levels—federal, state, and local—is often considered the unique American contribution to constitution-making.

Accompanying this horizontal division of power is the vertical division between levels of government. Although it is recognized that the old layer-cake analogy of the American governmental system is not valid and that a marble-cake comparison more closely approximates reality, the system is still characterized by a division of power. The division between levels is not clear, but each level still possesses power of independent action and can bring to the governmental bargaining table considerable leverage.

Another division within the institutional system which has acquired new importance in the postwar period is the governmental system within metropolitan areas. These areas are characterized by a multiplicity of overlapping governmental jurisdictions, and each unit possesses limited amounts of independent power, particularly the power to block coordinated action by all the jurisdictions within the area.

This institutional system is surrounded and populated by individuals and groups seeking to use it to serve their interests. Many efforts have been made to identify these power-seekers and to measure their relative influence. Such efforts have not been completely successful and the efforts which have been made have not produced consistent answers.

At the national level various answers have been found which have identified a variety of power-possessors. These include political parties, interest groups, a conspiratorial power elite, congressional committee chairmen, and demagogic politicians. This list does not exhaust the possibilities.

There have been some contemporary efforts to explain in sweeping generalizations the present power structure of society. C. Wright Mills, for example, argues that power rests in the hands of a loose alliance of military, business, and political leaders, while James Burnham finds that power rests with a new emerging managerial elite. Even these writings and others like them, however, are not in the mainstream of contemporary social science.

The fact is that the tools of the political scientist are not sufficiently sharp to identify with precision the national power structure, particularly whether the country is dominated by a small power elite. As one student of this issue pointed out, those who know least about it write the most, and those who know the most—the participants—don't talk.

In general there appears to be a consensus among most political scientists that power at the national level is pluralistic in character, reflecting in part the institutional system. A good number of students believe that the pluralistic character of the system, except in times of great crisis, stands in the way of effective government. The system, they argue, is characterized by veto groups—groups able to block action but unable to combine for positive programs.

A recent study adhering to this position is James MacGregor Burns's book, The Deadlock of Democracy: Four-Party Politics in America. Burns argues that the issues which face the country today demand vigorous positive government and that the present constellation of forces prohibits such action. Finding that our party system is a four-party system, he identifies the congressional parties as those which dominate. Representing parochial interests and possessing many members who come from one-party constituencies, these parties within Congress are not interested in positive national programs. It is the presidential parties which have national constituencies and represent a national interest. Normally hamstrung by the congressional parties, the presidential parties are unable to translate their national orientation into legislative programs.

Although a great deal remains to be learned about the interrelation of power structure and political institutions at the national level, the present system does not appear well adapted to coordinated, long-range planning.

Turning to the local level, the interaction is apparently not substantially different in its results, but more is known about the distribution of power. Although there is some disagreement about whether there is a single elite which dominates at the community level or a multiplicity of elites, the emerging consensus points in the direction of multiplicity. This pluralistic power structure at the community level may not have characterized the local system in the past, and there is no certainty that it will in the future, but the evidence indicates that it now does.

The general pattern of this pluralism seems to center around issue- or program-oriented elites which may, but do not necessarily, overlap. The influentials in one issue area are seldom exactly the same as the influentials in another area. The present system of fragmented government at the local level probably aids the perpetuation of this pattern but does not appear responsible for it, nor does it appear likely that the pattern would disappear if there were a single governing body for each metropolitan area. The influentials, in other words, are not organized in accord with political boundaries but rather around issues. The elites in many cases attract membership from across jurisdictional lines. Many of the business leadership groups which have come into being in the last few years to aid urban redevelopment have interests and memberships which are area- rather than jurisdiction-wide.

In trying to understand the influence pattern which exists in any community, it is not only necessary to identify the decision-makers, but to understand why they possess influence. Students are attempting to discover "why" through the identification of the political resources possessed by influentials. One of the most sophisticated students in the field, Robert Dahl, has identified nine such resources: money and credit, control over jobs, control over the information of others, social standing, knowledge and expertness, popularity, legality, ethnic solidarity, and the right to vote.[1]

Possessing resources capable of influencing decision-making does not mean employing such resources fully at all times. In fact, studies made thus far indicate that except in moments of crisis, political resources are very seldom used fully. Dahl describes it this way: "Very few people seem to exploit their resources to the limit in order to influence political officials; and even political officials often have resources available to them which they do not fully use. But precisely because of the existence of these slack resources, a great many significant, abrupt, short-run changes in the distribution of influence can be brought about; for whenever someone in the community begins to exploit his available and hitherto unused resources more fully and efficiently than before, he gains markedly in influence."

This slack use of political resources not only helps to explain certain patterns of influence, but is also suggestive of opportunities for those interested in bringing about social change. It helps explain, for example, why it has been possible for public officials in some areas to exert dynamic and vigorous leadership. It also helps explain why a university study or other activity may have a sudden and significant impact.

These studies of power structure have not, of course, explained the whole phenomenon. Only a few communities have been investigated, and the results from these few have not been uniform. Further, understanding has not progressed very far if the only conclusion reached is that power is rather widely shared. Not enough studies have been done to explain, for example, the dominance of different kinds of elites in different communities.

---

[1] Robert Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961).

As with the ideological environment, the institutional system and power structure arrangement does not positively encourage social planning, but it does not absolutely prevent it, either. Before relating the relevance of this knowledge of power to university involvement in social change, it is necessary to examine the public decision-making process.

Decision-Making Process and Planning

It is with the actual decision-making process that our lack of knowledge of the causes and consequences of change plays a vital role. If the social sciences had developed into a truly predictive science, the institutional and environmental limitations on social planning would be more troublesome. We do not have, however, a predictive science. We cannot be sure that our plans will have the consequences we design them to accomplish.

In view of this limitation it is not surprising that our decision system produces decisions which introduce not large-scale and grandiose changes, but small incremental changes. Charles Lindblom has provided the most comprehensive description of the process, applying it largely to public administration but pointing out that "the incremental character of political change in the United States has often been remarked. The two major political parties agree on fundamentals; they offer alternative policies to the voters only on relatively small points of difference."

It is not surprising that this basic political characteristic is repeated at the administrative level. Students of administration have become aware in recent years of the inseparability of the political and administrative processes. Lindblom tells us further that this concentration on small incremental changes is reasonable "given the limits on knowledge within which policy-makers are confined." He argues that "simplifying by limiting the focus to small variations from present policy makes the most of available knowledge."

Incremental decision-making may, of course, produce for any particular decision unanticipated consequences. The decision-makers are normally concerned with only one set of issues and, in their efforts to simplify the analysis of a problem, they inevitably ignore important possible consequences.

Such unanticipated consequences are not necessarily bad. For example, a political party may make a conscious effort to transfer governmental responsibilities from a lesser to a more general governmental jurisdiction, from city to county, for example. The purpose of the transfer is to protect the party's power position. It sees for itself long-run political control of the county and a possible political loss of the city. The unanticipated consequences of the movement of these functions may result in better coordinated, more economic services, although this was not the purpose of the transfer. It is, of course, just as possible that the unanticipated consequences will be less helpful.

It can be argued that the system has built-in protections against consequences which violate important values held by any significant part of the community. Since all interests are free to organize and to use their resources to protect their interests, it is possible that even when all consequences are not considered by the actual decision-maker, others will be aware of them and will use their influence to either redress the damage done or alter or stop the action before the decision is made.

Granting the general accuracy of this picture does not necessitate concluding that the best possible policy or planning emerges from the process. The system obviously has a negative bias. It is easier to stop action than to initiate it. Further, it assumes a kind of equality of political influence for different interests which is highly unlikely, or it assumes that present distribution of political resources is the "right" distribution.

As with the ideological environment and the institutional and power system, the decision process in both its administrative and political dimensions does not lend itself to large-scale social planning. The most significant aspect of the decision system is its inability to produce decisions which accomplish more than small incremental changes.

The Relationship of University Involvement to the Power System and Decision-Making

The power-structure system provides many points of access for universities. Since the power structure is not monolithic, it is possible for universities, through their many activities, to find points in the system where they can get a hearing. Politicians searching for issues and for solutions to problems will go to whoever will give advice and help.

These points of access, however, do not solve the problem of the translation of university research findings into public policy. There are few individuals on either the university or government side who are capable of playing this intermediary role. More and more of the problems which face society are of a kind which require deep and substantive research for solution. Yet often the findings which grow out of highly technical and often abstract university research cannot be automatically applied to many of the problems as they are seen by the politician.

Individuals, however, may be emerging on both sides who can play this translating role. For government there are public officials who are sufficiently intellectually curious to take university research and translate it into policy alternatives; or they may have staffs who are able to do that for them. At the same time within our universities there are a few scholars who are adept at this art. In fact, there is a steady stream of academic types into and out of government who play this role directly.

Since there are many access points in the system, it follows that the university scholar serves a great variety of masters and interests; even individuals within the same university may be giving different advice to different public officials. Such a practice is consistent with the pluralism of American society, and just as the public power-structure side is not monolithic, neither is the university side. There is no university position relative to specific social issues; rather there are findings of university scholars which may be used by those in power to advance the solutions which they think are best.

In many ways the resulting university role is not completely satisfying to any of the participants. The university scholar is not in a position of immediate power and influence but must play a secondary role. Further, since the power system is pluralistic, the acceptance of the scholar's solutions by one part of the system does not ensure their acceptance by another. This situation leads to a great deal of frustration on the part of the scholar. Equally, the advice which flows from the university to the outside world is not all consistent, and this leads the man in the street to wonder whether university people know anything at all.

The incremental system of decision-making which characterizes American public life is also frustrating to the scholar. He likes to tackle problems whole and come up with complete solutions. Seldom are the solutions he proposes accepted in exactly the way he states them. Rather, they are modified; and sometimes they are combined with what he thinks are inconsistent measures suggested by others.

This incremental process of public decision-making is the other side of the pluralistic power system. They both create frustrations for university people and cause a good number of students to throw up their hands in despair and withdraw to their studies. Equally, university demands that fundamental solutions be tried cause public officials to distrust university advisors.

This difficulties grow out of the inherent characteristics of the American system, but the fact is that the politician is more and more dependent on substantive experts. His relationship to such scholars because of their independence may frighten him, yet he must use them. There have been attempts by people in the public sector to get around this problem by establishing in-house research operations. This process will continue, but in the last analysis it will have to be the universities which provide the kind of assistance needed. It is the very independence that the government official dislikes that makes the university attractive to the scholar. Even organizations like the Rand Corporation cannot provide the independence and the openness of the university.

There must continue to be, therefore, university involvement in social change. The necessary relationships with the public sector will never be completely happy, and perhaps that is as it should be. Tension itself has advantages. For the university administrator, however, who must deal with local and state and national governmental agencies on a day-to-day basis, this long-run view is not particularly comforting. The trouble which his scholars cause him will undoubtedly continue to create unhappiness. By the same token, the public official who must use the university scholar will probably never be completely at ease with him. Neat solutions to these internal tensions are simply not possible. They are an inevitable part of the system.

TEACHING AND RESEARCH: THEIR INFLUENCE ON SOCIAL CHANGE

by

John E. Bebout

Bebout examines the influence of teaching and research—primarily the work of the university—on social change. Teaching and research are the foremost generators of social change; thus the success with which we cope with present and future problems depends on the university. The university is in a unique position of relative independence and freedom, and must maintain this institutional integrity to have the needed effect. The university's influence must be mainly a humanizing one; the university must assess society's needs and respond to them by providing humane direction to social change, it must stress planning and try to foresee the effects of change. Thus it must emphasize teaching, particularly the training of teachers, give more attention to integrating and communicating research, stress the humanities and social sciences, and pursue scientific studies within a set of values and research within the framework of policy.

John E. Bebout is Director of the Urban Studies Center and Professor of Political Science at Rutgers. He was Executive Assistant to Governor Charles Edison of New Jersey and consultant to the Alaska Statehood Committee, the U. S. Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the New Jersey Commission on Municipal Government. He is co-author of Where Cities Meet—The Urbanization of New Jersey.

TEACHING AND RESEARCH: THEIR INFLUENCE ON SOCIAL CHANGE

Background

In order to establish the context of this discussion, I must begin with some rather elementary observations and references to history. It would be easy to dismiss the influence of teaching and research with the obvious statement that the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge or presumed knowledge has always been the principal generator of social change. It is mainly through learning that people create new conditions for themselves, and the process both constitutes and induces what we call social change. Research is a sophisticated, hopefully short-cut technique for multiplying knowledge. Through their research and teaching, therefore, modern universities play a major role in producing social change.

It is true that social change may be induced by alterations in the physical or human environment resulting from external forces, such as changes in climate or the productivity of the soil, natural disasters like fire or flood, or contact with other groups of people. But the social effects of even these external influences are conditioned by the learning or teaching processes of the people affected. For practical purposes we can probably rule out biological change or human evolution as an influence on social change except on a very long-term basis, although this may not be possible in the future if the eugenicists succeed in influencing public and social policy appreciably. In any event, any changes resulting from the conscious alteration of the biological quality of mankind could prove to be the greatest or perhaps the last achievements of research and teaching.

The most profound or significant social changes often result from research and teaching directed toward quite different ends. Thus, for example, the communications revolution and the so-called knowledge explosion are to a large extent the results of scientific and technological developments motivated by war and national defense. Many of the social problems concentrated in our old cities are the results in part of the agricultural revolution which was the product of the technological revolution and of research and teaching emanating from the land-grant colleges. The contribution of the Land-Grant College Act to urbanization may prove to be of more long-range importance than its contributions to rural life.

Research and teaching are, of course, motivated by a variety of attitudes toward social change. They have often been directed toward stopping, preventing, or reversing a change considered undesirable. At the other extreme, they are the principal weapons of the revolutionary. A more nearly neutral purpose, commonly espoused in the schools, is simply to help people and institutions to accommodate or adjust to ongoing changes. We are now in this country, it seems to me, entering an era in which research and teaching are being more and more purposefully used as tools for planning, guiding, and administering social change.

This country has pioneered in the use of research and teaching to support national or widely held public purposes. Thus the colonial colleges were established partly to enable the new, frontier society to develop its own intellectuals, especially its own lawyers, clergymen, and other professionals, uncontaminated by bias built into education in the mother country. It is significant that many of the leaders in the American Revolution, especially in the era of constitution-making, studied in these American colleges. It was widely believed by the founding fathers, and most eloquently expressed by Thomas Jefferson, that widespread education of the people for citizenship, as well as for personal competence, was a necessity for the kind of republican society they were trying to build. Hence came the national concern for education expressed in acts such as the Northwest Ordinance, even before the Constitution of 1787. From these and other early educational initiatives ultimately developed the American public school and state university systems, new to the world and still in many respects distinctive to this country. Later, the Land-Grant College Act initiated an entirely new kind of partnership between national, state, and local authorities in the educational enterprise, a partnership which has been greatly expanded in scope and is now, as a result of legislation enacted during the present administration, burgeoning at an explosive rate.

In general, I am sure, we all assume the basic soundness of the course that American society and its educational handmaid have taken and the essential validity of the long-range purposes and goals toward which we have been striving. Nevertheless, we must recognize that social change is not necessarily "good," and may be destructive of human values that we hold to be important. Even in America, social change may result from human ignorance, folly, and wickedness, as well as from wisdom and goodness of purpose; and research and teaching can and do serve the former as well as the latter. There was, for example, the teaching, backed up by research of a sort, which along with the cotton gin fastened the "peculiar institution" of slavery on the South after that institution was supposed to be on the way out. Again, consider the social harm that has been done and continues to be done by false teaching about racial differences.

Perhaps perfect knowledge would bring perfectly benign results. Knowledge and godliness have, in most faiths, been assumed to be highly correlated. Nevertheless, we must admit that we have a long way to go before research and teaching can be counted on invariably to enhance the good, the true, and the beautiful. We will certainly know how to create life in a test tube before we know how to derive these qualities directly from research or even to describe them in the language of science.

Yet in our culture the whole knowledge enterprise is largely justified and heavily motivated by a faith that research and teaching can and do help "make things better." On the strictly material level, there is ample evidence in support of this faith. The fact that we are currently so deeply troubled by doubts about how knowledge can contribute to more general human happiness, well-being, and dignity may portend the day when the veil between knowledge and truth will be lifted and the researcher, the teacher, and the preacher will work as one.

Despite the centuries-old Judeo-Christian doctrine of the unity of goodness, the values we have been taught to live by are fractioned out and expressed in categorical, self-limiting, and often contradictory term In like manner, despite a scientific belief in a universe of law, the teachings of science have been parceled out in bits and pieces by practitioners of different disciplines and schools. In each case ultimate unity, if it exists, is obscured, and harmony, if it appears, tends to be parochial and imposed.

Is it too much to suggest that there is a connection among such diverse contemporary phenomena as the attempts of Einstein and other scientists to break through old categories and penetrate to ultimate reality in the physical universe, of men of religion and theology to disengage from cramping and divisive dogmas and discover a deeper and more nearly universal meaning of goodness, and of men of action to develop programs and forms of organization directed toward meeting the needs and wants of persons and societies as wholes rather than as separate and unrelated entities? In the jargon of modern policy or program research and management, the "systems approach" is being tried simultaneously in all these fields. The fact that it is being tried by people starting from quite different backgrounds and premises suggests that there may be in the making a framework and methodology that will enable research, without becoming tyrannical, to play a more direct and creative role in the search for meaning and value in the life of man.

The findings of research and the teaching based on them have in the past invalidated many dearly held values by destroying their supposed factual base. By the same token, new knowledge brings new strength or support to other values. For example, fairly recent research in several areas has given support to some of the essential values built into the civil rights and economic opportunities programs now under way in this country.

There doubtless are short-range situations when it may appear that ignorance is bliss and that it is therefore folly to be wise. However, in an age of accelerating social change, it is doubtful if we can afford much more of the bliss of ignorance. In short, ignorance, like sloth and sheer fecklessness, must be equated with folly. Ignorance may once have furnished some excuse for the lack of sanitation which in times past has disrupted societies or caused most unpleasant changes in their behavior. Even in this more enlightened age, to use a Jeffersonian euphemism, we still are creating social problems and pathologies by our careless treatment of land, air, water, and the biological environment. A similar observation could be made about the monumental folly involved in perpetuating the ancient, distinctively human institution of war, powered by modern weapons.

Someone may remind me that this paper is supposed to be about the influence of teaching and research, presumably of wisdom, on social change. Having already pointed out the sometimes questionable connection between teaching and wisdom, I merely observe at this point that war on ignorance and folly in their effect on society is a major, never-by the issues and imperatives of change; on the responsibility of the larger society of state and nation for the care and feeding of universities as continuing sources of enlightenment; and on the universities' need to come to terms with the future as they have more or less with the past.

I am assuming that we wish to achieve a level of social planning that will assure survival and an enlargement of human well-being within the context of a pluralistic, fairly permissive society which continues to value variety, personal freedom, and the integrity and initiative of the individual. The hope of success in this effort, I firmly believe, depends to a very considerable extent upon the way in which American universities play their role. As of now, they constitute one of our best hedges either against disaster born of ignorance and folly or against the smothering of our most precious social values and national goals in an Orwellian nightmare.

This faith in the universities is based largely on the very special position that they have come to occupy in American society. I have already hinted at some of the historical background for this position. American universities constitute the largest, most versatile, and most talent-laden system of higher education in the world. Moreover, they are the capstone of by far the most powerful educational establishment (please excuse the expression) on the globe. And, while they do not run the extensive public and private research and development enterprises, they are essential to them as suppliers of knowledge and talent.

The potency and prestige of the universities is evidenced by the ways in which governments at all levels, private industries, and voluntary organizations rely upon them for special jobs of research, teaching, and consultation, and look to them not only as reservoirs of knowledge but also as pools of talent for a multiplicity of missions. American universities owe this position in part to two quite distinct yet in some respects merging trends: (1) the trend toward the development of strong private institutions, which began with the founding of the colonial colleges; and (2) the trend toward public education which started in the earliest days of the republic and has resulted in a system of public universities in all the states, purposefully oriented toward service to the society through the education of competent participating citizens, the training of needed professionals, and the discovery of useful knowledge.

The unique land-grant college system for relating research and teaching to each other and to the emerging needs of society through an extension system that acts as an intelligence service for two-way communication between the university and the community has enhanced the social relevance of all American universities. The land-grant tradition has spread into the private universities and caused many of them to assume a public service role hardly distinguishable from that of the other institutions. On the other hand, the existence of strong private universities and colleges has supplied yardsticks and competition which have helped the public universities to achieve levels of quality and maintain a measure of independence that they might not otherwise have enjoyed. Fortunately, there is every reason to believe that this dual system will survive and grow in vigor in both its parts. It is now settled public policy for government to lend support to private universities not only through research contracts but also by other devices in aid of instruction, students, and the expansion of the physical plant. While it seems inevitable that the public universities will have to absorb the major part of the increasing business of higher education, the strong position of private institutions seems assured not only because of the public support just mentioned but also because of continuing preferential aid from foundations and other private donors.

In addition to these circumstances, the element of decentralization built into the public system by virtue of the fact that the fifty states and a number of cities, not the national government, are in charge of all but a few highly specialized institutions, puts the American system in a unique position for dealing with strong outside institutions while maintaining a high degree of independence and institutional integrity.

Sometimes it seems to me that there is too little awareness, both in and out of the universities, of the strength and crucial nature of the universities' position. What universities and the American people make of this position for the future will depend heavily upon how the universities themselves resolve some rather critical issues and problems and meet other matters of high obligation during the next generation. Important choices must be made and priorities determined, not once and for all, but on a continuing basis. Powerful attention must be given to the problem of "social change" within the institution, the problem of the adaptability of the institution and its programs and methods to the expanding demands of a changing society. And above all, universities must perform some extremely vital services without which the society cannot survive and which no other institution in existence or in conceivable prospect can perform.

Underlying all other questions and inherent in most of them is the question of institutional identity or definition. What is it about a university that distinguishes it from other institutions and gives it its peculiar function? Or to put the question in more active terms, what character or stance must the university maintain in order to hold its license for leadership in the production and dissemination of knowledge and intellectual and professional competence?

I once wrote, "The university should always remember that it is an educator, not the governor of men."[1] Unfortunately, this sentence by itself does not say very much. In the article in which it appears, I discussed at some length the matter of values and goals, the problem of involvement, and the terms on which university representatives may deal with decision-makers caught up in and seeking to manage urban change. In general, I took the position that the university must have a commitment to the melioration of urban society, that it cannot be neutral with respect to such a basic issue as the goal of "integration of the human beings who make up the society," and that it must take some risks as the price of effective participation in the application of knowledge to affect or direct social change. About the best I could produce in the way of advice on how to survive outside the cloister was to restate in various ways the proposition that the university must find its own way to serve the higher goals of the society in a manner compatible with the values of scholarly inquiry and responsible education. In short, I was suggesting that the function of the university with respect to social change in our urban society must be based upon sound scholarship, motivated by social commitment that is powered by a degree of daring, and governed by an essentially political sense of the limits of feasibility. I hope it is not a bad sign that I find myself taking substantially the same position today.

Let me add here one observation that may reveal a personal bias or, I would prefer to say, a sense of style. It never has made any sense

---

[1] John E. Bebout, "University Services to the Urban Community, *American Behavioural Scientist*, Vol. VI (September, 1963), No. 6, pp. 21-39.

to me to have educators assert publicly, as one did at a well-known teacher's college back in the late 1920's, that the principal duty of teachers (in this case, public school teachers) is to create social revolution. This kind of self-assertive overstatement can be accepted as true in a certain context, but it certainly confuses the public and arouses a considerable segment to take protective measures against what is largely an imaginary threat. Most university researchers and teachers who go about their proper business will, whether they intend it or not, contribute to the inevitable continuing social revolution. They should, indeed, intend it in the sense that they should at least be aware of and therefore conscientious about the probable consequences of their actions. But they need not and should not overadvertise themselves as men of action.

There are, of course, limits on the university's freedom of decision and choice. This freedom is limited by university organization and tradition, by the nature and degree of flexibility of the demands and responses of governmental and other institutions, and by the sheer weight of the massive and mounting demand for basic undergraduate and professional education which loads current facilities and resources almost unbearably. Yet I suggest that in reality universities have more freedom and autonomy than they often recognize and that they can learn to retain and stretch this freedom, partly by facing up specifically and hard-headedly to certain questions of priority and propriety. Fortunately, universities have begun to break through one basic limitation—their own long-standing failure to recognize the facts of accelerating changes that are shaking up old institutions all over the world.

The university world has already made important progress toward joining the late twentieth century. The universities, along with the rest of the country, have, however belatedly, discovered that as a result of urbanization the society of which they are now a part is a very different one from that in which most of them were established. This post-World War II discovery of urban America came later than it should have and did not really begin to have much influence on university policy until the late 1950's. Witness the fact that most conferences of the type for which this paper was written, a conference on the university in urban society, have occurred since that period. In any event, the discovery has now occurred. That discovery, together with the discovery of outer space and a new view, amounting to rediscovery, of the rest of the world, has, I hope, sufficiently shaken up the universities to enable them to slough off outmoded attitudes and ways and to become more venturesome and innovative. Let us now look at a number of questions having to do with the use of present and future university resources, questions that need to be considered in the context of urban or, as some would have it, of post-urban society.

One of the most difficult problems to resolve has to do with the proper balance between different kinds of teaching and research. The teaching demands imposed upon institutions of higher learning are far in excess of the readiness of those institutions to meet them satisfactorily. Yet in our open society, dedicated to the proposition that everyone is entitled to as much education as he can take, we must meet this demand in some way. We are, to be sure, in the process of lessening the pressure on the universities by the belated development of state and community colleges, junior colleges, and technical institutions. But if this development is not to result for an excessive period in inferior teaching of large numbers of students, the universities must in some way meet the need to train and retrain teachers for these institutions. Since it is the products of these institutions who will constitute the great bulk of the college-trained citizenry of the country in the years ahead and will provide a considerable number of those who go on for graduate or professional education, the kind of teaching they receive, especially as it affects their understanding and attitudes toward social change, can be crucial for the future. At the same time, the realization of the need for the repeated or constant re-education of people in many walks of life to meet the vocational, civic, and personal requirements of a changing society is increasing the demand upon universities to engage in continuing education and to prepare teachers for continuing education in other settings.

"New math," new geography," and other new approaches to teaching subjects, and new insights into the motivations and capacities of students in elementary and secondary schools are putting pressures on our whole teacher training system, pressures which it is unprepared to meet and which call for participation of university people who have regarded teacher training as separate or apart from their proper concern. Some earlier experimental programs now being augmented by the regional laboratories set up under the Primary and Secondary Education Act have begun to involve such people in research and demonstration programs that, if developed with sufficient skill and resources, could effect a much needed revolution in the whole system of public education. This, it seems to me, is a matter of the highest priority if we are to have a citizenry able to live with and give some rational direction to social change.

The immediate and urgent need for more, better, and more versatile teaching by the universities necessarily raises the unpleasant question of the allocation of resources between teaching and research. We need new knowledge, but I cannot help feeling that there is something in the old farmer's remark that he did not need new knowledge because he wasn't farming anything like as well as he knew how already! Unwelcome as the thought may be, especially to a great many highly competent and aspiring academic people, we may have to ask some of them for the time being to "neglect" their research in favor of students. For too many this would be the reversal of the customary practice, encouraged, I would suggest, by questionable criteria for promotion and prestige. It does little good to society to pile up new knowledge in laboratories or in more or less esoteric professional publications, unless we take the time and the trouble to communicate that knowledge to others—not only to others who may build on it for further research, but also to others who may communicate and use that part of it which is capable of being put to work in the service of men and society. In short, we need to consider the problem of matching the accumulating products of the knowledge explosion with an equal capacity for disseminating them.

Another problem in resource allocation involves the balance between investment in hard science and technology on the one hand, and social science, management techniques, and the humanities on the other. Hard science and technology have had a very vigorous run, largely as a result of the exigencies of "national defense." These exigencies have accelerated basic exploration into the nature of the universe and have spawned new communications and space technologies. At the same time, they have increased our experience with various kinds of interdisciplinary research and advanced the so-called systems approach to both research and management. Social science has been brought into play in a variety of ways, but, relatively, the "soft areas" of knowledge have not been advanced at anything like the pace of the "hard areas." Since we need more profound knowledge of the physical universe and could do with better technologies derived from that knowledge, I would not suggest that progress in this area should be appreciably slowed. I do, however, suggest that a greater proportion of our resources should be allocated to the social science and management areas, because there can be no question that the most troublesome areas of ignorance, from the point of view of human well-being, are in the social and institutional sectors.

By the same token, we need to increase, not to decrease, as we seem in danger of doing, attention to the humanities. I speculated hopefully somewhat earlier that we might look forward to more positive contributions from science and scientific method to the clarification and development of the values and goals without which life would have no savor and social development could have no rational direction. Little or none of the world's store of wisdom has sprung full-blown from the test tube, the simulation center, or the behavioral scientists' survey sample, although it is being increasingly fed by information derived from these sources. Wisdom and its handmaid, perceptivity, have, throughout the centuries, been enriched especially by poets and other creative writers; by artists; by philosophers and seers; by historians with the imagination to distinguish as well as to relate past, present, and future; and by "soft" social scientists who have studied human behavior and institutions with some of the art and awareness of these others, tempered more or less by an infusion of method derived from the sciences. Nothing that has happened has made these people and their roles obsolete, and there appears to be no prospect that they will become obsolete to the end of human time. Society may have an increasing need for them as man's knowledge and mastery of nature grows, and the universities have a corresponding obligation to nourish them and give them voice.

Even the values inherent in the scientific method—rationality, integrity, open-mindedness, freedom to pursue and to utter the truth—have not simply been self-generated by science nor do the social sanctions for these values rest solely on the scientific enterprise. Moreover, if man is to survive, and if he is to remain humane in any sense that most of us would accept, the application and even the pursuit of science must be monitored by values that, so far as can yet be foreseen, must be derived from the whole corpus of human experience and the full range of human insight. If this is true with respect to science and scientists, it is even more emphatically true with respect to social planning and all those who seek to give meaningful guidance and direction to social change, whether large or small. In short, the planner, the administrator, the politician, the sovereign citizen all need the wisdom, to say nothing of the consolation and joy that are peculiarly the cultural yield of the humanities as surely as they need the knowledge and skills derived from the sciences, physical, natural, and social.

Assuming, as I suggested earlier, that we need more emphasis on research in the social sciences, we must consider the problem of allocation as between so-called basic and applied or policy-oriented research. There certainly should be an increase in research directed to basic, theoretically derived problems. The whole history of science teaches us that great progress in applied science is dependent upon progress motivated primarily by the simple desire to know more about the nature of things. The Einstein contribution to nuclear weaponry is a striking case in point. However, since we must act as wisely as possible on questions inexorably raised by galloping social change, there is need for a great deal of respectful attention by university people to applied or policy-oriented research which puts the findings of "pure" science into a new context, relating them to facts of other orders, and thus also producing new knowledge.

The demand for action on such questions as poverty, civil rights, and decaying cities, accentuated by the natural jitteriness of politicians and leaders of protest groups, has resulted in the launching of vast new programs with a minimum of well-based planning, and in some cases with hardly any monitoring or evaluation. There is, under the circumstances, a strong temptation for universities to get into the action. I suggest that they need to be "where the action is," but that their prime function should be to insist with all the power of their position upon the necessity for basing action on knowledge; knowledge injected into planning and policy-making, knowledge applied by properly educated administrators, and knowledge applied to evaluating and testing the results of action. If universities get too deeply into the action, they run the risk of losing their ability to make this vital point effectively and to make their appropriate educational contributions.

The nature and variety of a given university's relationships with social action depend appropriately on distinctive elements in its style, competence, and posture with respect to the local, state, and national communities. It is one of the strengths of the American system of higher education that institutions differ in these respects. Each university must discover for itself its best social role, partly in the light of the roles of others in its area or category. In evaluating its proper role and degree of involvement, it must face some hard questions and, as I have said before, exhibit some daring.

Whom should the university seek to teach directly? For a few it may be enough to say that except for providing occasional public lectures, the university should teach only enrolled undergraduate, graduate, or professional school students. What research should the university undertake? The answer might be only that research which faculty members, individually or collectively, choose to undertake on their own initiative.

Such a university might have a profound effect on social change. Because of the mystique of the classroom as the domain of the free and presumably competent scholar, it could have a considerable influence on future practitioners on the body social and politic without being called to question in the market place or at the hustings.

Most universities have, however, long since given this up and have provided shelter by embarking on various programs of extension teaching and sponsored or contract or problem-oriented research.

Whom should they teach in extension? Members and employees of the establishment? Leaders of protest and dissent? Persons seeking to improve their vocational competence or life enjoyment? People anxious to improve their political skills in order to agitate effectively for more political power and the fruits thereof? My answer is that many universities should be prepared to teach all of these, recognizing not only the differences in style and function involved but also the differential problems of financial support and public relations. Similarly, research activities should not be confined to seeking acceptable (or otherwise unpublished) answers to problems posed by the right people.

Fortunately for the university's ability to work for the poor as well as the rich, for the outsider as well as the insider, we are in a period when both government and foundations are supporting teaching and research directed toward the reduction of barriers to participation and exercise of power by the hitherto neglected segments of society. The university should take full advantage of this opportunity and strive to see to it that the society of knowledge, competence, and power becomes and remains truly open to all.

As I have said elsewhere, this does not mean that the universities should try to do all the teaching and all the research required to this end. Far from it. It is, however, highly appropriate for them to lead in finding out how to do teaching that has not been done before by engaging for a time in experimental or demonstration projects with a view to developing the techniques and training of teachers (who may not necessarily be professionals in the traditional sense) to carry on the work under the auspices of other agencies.

In like manner, limited social action demonstration projects are appropriate and, in the present state of the art, necessary methods of learning about social change that modern universities cannot neglect. Such projects may involve a rich combination of research and teaching experiences almost certain to enlighten the university, whatever their immediate contribution to the community may be. The possible forms of university involvement in such projects may range from direct sponsorship and management to limited participation under contract or agreement in particular aspects of it. Full sponsorship is probably undesirable except in rare instances, but for maximum benefit the university should be involved in planning and be privy to administration; it should also act as purveyor of instruction and advice or performer of research. One caveat is important: A university should assume no responsibility, even that of observer, for which it does not have some competence and for which there is not in sight adequate fiscal and personal support.

The relationships between the university's teaching and research roles and social change cannot be fully assessed or properly managed without reference to the university's status or behavior as a corporate citizen of its community. Almost any university, even the most cloistered, must recognize special obligations toward the community in which it is located, if for no other reason than that it is a significant holder of property, generally tax exempt, an employer of local people, and a generator of governmental and social problems in the area. Unfortunately, universities have not always been the best neighbors or the most socially minded landlords of income producing property. As universities expand, especially in congested urban areas, the importance of these relationships increases. Indeed, in many small to medium-sized cities or neighborhoods of large cities, a university may well be or become by any measure the largest and most powerful corporate institution. Many of them, of course, are deeply involved in urban renewal activities for their own benefit, and an increasing number have come to recognize that their own survival in their chosen location, as well as the most elementary sense of public responsibility, requires them to be concerned with aspects of the human and social development of the area, which have too often been neglected in urban renewal. Only recently have the obligations of Columbia University been pointedly adverted to in the terms of a grant from the Ford Foundation.

While these local "town and gown" relationships have generally been thought of as primarily matters of concern for the administration, I suggest that they cannot be properly dealt with without reference to their effect upon and their potential constructive use of university teaching and research. The decision of a university to locate or relocate its whole plant or important elements in it at an urban, suburban, or rural site certainly should be affected by the kind of environment in which its teaching and research should be conducted and the kind of contacts with the community deemed desirable for its faculty and students. Equally important in determining university policy with respect to location should be recognition of the fact that its presence and its future growth are bound to be important factors in producing social change, including difficult social problems, in the area.

University obligations in this connection extend beyond such elementary matters as seeing to it that its presence does not put excessive uncompensated burdens on the local government or subject displaced people and businesses to unreasonable losses. They should engage research and teaching in efforts to develop an understanding both within and without the university of the university's community relationships and to assist in making them as constructive as possible for all concerned. These efforts may well involve the university in a more active role as a corporate citizen of the local community than would otherwise be appropriate in connection with an outside demonstration project. In any case, the university's community of residence provides a laboratory situation which it has both a unique opportunity and a special obligation to exploit.

The problem of allocating university resources is further complicated by the fact that the resources themselves are limited. In an affluent society able to produce the material goods it needs with a smaller and smaller proportion of the total manpower, universities should look

230

forward to and demand a larger absolute and proportionate part of national income and talent. Nevertheless, universities are necessarily in competition with other institutions and presumably will always have less at their disposal than they think they might be able to use. This fact of life underscores the importance and the difficulty of some of the questions of choice discussed above. It also should lead universities to try constantly to develop the capability of other institutions to perform various kinds of research and educational activities of specialized or limited application or of a repetitive nature. In other words, universities should always be on the frontier of the knowledge enterprise and, so far as possible, educate others to carry on necessary, more or less routine activities once they have been demonstrated. Failure to do this would tend to result in the accumulation of excess baggage, including large numbers of people with vested interests in continuing to do things as they have always done them, and would accentuate the tendency already displayed in some universities to excessive mass which becomes either top-heavy or torpid. We have, therefore, insisted that it is the business of the Urban Studies Center at Rutgers to be constantly working itself out of old jobs so that it can take on new and more exciting ones.

The complaint is often made that government—especially the national government—foundations, and private institutions have more to say than the universities about the allocation of resources. I would answer that the universities have really not been so badly put upon as they sometimes claim, and that on occasion it has been a very good thing that they have been induced by promise of outside funding to change emphasis or develop new activities. Be that as it may, if the universities are reasonably clear about their proper agenda, they are in a good position to educate governments, foundations, and private industries into a mood to support it. In short, the extent to which the universities, in their own special field, the dissemination and development of knowledge, are to be actors rather than reactors will depend largely upon themselves, acting singly and, for vital limited purposes, on a common front.

One of the most important objectives of a common front should be to present forcefully to governments and other institutions the fact that if they want more help from the universities, they must assume an increasing responsibility for institutional support. The universities must make it crystal clear that their ability to undertake projects and to carry them through productively depends upon the continuing strength and vigor of the institution and that neither government nor private industry should ask the universities to undertake projects at the expense of their basic teaching role or of the freedom of their faculties to pursue within reason their own self-directed intellectual interests. Government and business must get over the notion that a university is like an old-fashioned longshoremen's hiring hall, with a lot of professors standing around, ready to "shape up" on call. And foundations, as well as government, need to ask themselves more often, when they give a "pump-priming" grant, just where the continuing flow of water is going to come from, and at what cost to whom.

Perhaps more difficult to deal with than governments and foundations in the effort to maintain institutional integrity, competence, and social relevance, are the academic and professional guilds that have largely determined the university's image and style. The professional guilds—doctors, educators, engineers, lawyers, social workers, and others—that seek to control curricula and the output of new members of their guilds, have long been a force tending toward rigidity and conservatism. In a somewhat different class, but not very different in their aspirations and influence, are the academic guilds, whose members staff the faculties in science, social science, and the humanities. To a very considerable extent, the universities have traditionally been the creatures of these guilds. Like the medieval craft and trade guilds, the modern professional associations perform extremely valuable functions, but like the medieval guilds, they tend to become ingrowing, self-protective, and restrictive in their adherence to customs, rules, and standards derived from past, rather than from future conditions. At the present time, perhaps the worst thing about some of them is their unreadiness to face honestly the problem of the short supply of professionals in their field. Instead of leading, they too often resist efforts to increase this supply or to strengthen its effectiveness by training and admitting to some kind of respectable intellectual citizenship people who are able to perform many duties related to the business or the profession but who do not have full professional education.

Happily, the ultimate legal government of universities, both public and private, is vested in so-called lay boards. These boards, and the administrators who report to them, have, it seems to me, an obligation to assert more vigorous leadership in the effort to overcome the inertia built into the system of professional associations. By the same token, the leaders and members of these associations have an even greater obligation to review their practices, to train their sights more definitely on the future, and to recognize that the only real justification for their existence is their capacity to help their members to serve society better than they otherwise could. Fortunately, some reduction in professional rigidity and isolationism can be brought about by changing the education that members of the professions and disciplines receive. There is a natural tendency to emphasize the need for more and more special knowledge at the sacrifice of general knowledge. The result is that we have increasingly competent professional technicians who tend to be increasingly ignorant of the society and total environment in which they function. The medical profession, I venture to suggest, is one of the extreme examples of the results of this tendency. However, there is growing awareness among more thoughtful and urbane professionals that they cannot perform their special functions properly in such splendid intellectual isolation. A university should require anyone who goes out to practice with its seal of approval to have some knowledge of the society and especially of the changing and developing aspects of the society. Moreover, this general or social knowledge should be included in the continuing or mid-career education to which we are of necessity becoming more and more committed. Education in social relevance should promote a continuing redefinition of the roles of the several professions and disciplines and a blurring of the lines between them. The Urban Studies Center at Rutgers and other similar agencies have, accordingly, been experimenting with ways to increase the social I.Q.'s of persons in various walks of life, in mid-career.

I have already suggested that the problem of social change is as critical inside as outside the university. Universities need continually to study themselves in order to adapt their own organizations, their methods, and their programs to the requirements of change. For example, the continuing study of the university should cover conditions of promotion, compensation, tenure, and prestige, some of which now certainly tend to discourage venturing on the part of individual faculty members and tend to defeat efforts at bridging boundaries between disciplines and schools. The question of the autonomy of schools and departments is a perennially troublesome one. There is good reason for a considerable degree of autonomy in the several parts of a large and complicated university, but autonomy is a means, not an end. It should not excuse the university from its over-all responsibility for performance. There is nothing more difficult than for a department or school that has allowed itself to deteriorate in quality or in relevance to the times to pull itself up by its own intellectual bootstraps. There should be a firm understanding among university scholars and administrators that such a condition is properly subject to correction by discreet exercise of high university prerogative. Moreover, a particular department or school should not necessarily have the right to say that the university may not do something new in its claimed field or area of interest without its consent. Internal competition can invigorate a university as well as any other institution.

Since New Deal days, at least, a new relationship has been developing between the university and the world of action. This relationship has uncovered a host of unresolved issues and problems. Some have already been discussed in one context or another, but a few others may be touched on by way of further illustration. There are, for example, the problems of the "in and out" and the part-time faculty member, to say nothing of the full-time faculty member with a heavy load of outside consultant work. These problems receive a good deal of attention from administrators and committees, with results seldom wholly satisfactory to anybody. I suggest that universities, like other institutions, should place higher value than many of them do on mobility and interchange of personnel and be prepared to adjust their policies with respect to work load, tenure, fringe benefits, and leave of absence. The inconvenience suffered may be more than balanced by enrichment resulting from the outside relationships. It should be observed, however, that flexibility in this respect is difficult with such lean staffing patterns as all too many schools and departments must now live with.

Traditionally, universities have managed many of their direct contacts with the community through extension divisions and research or other institutes, with varying degrees of distance from the more traditional academic departments. Thus, we have at Rutgers the Eagleton Institute of Politics; the Bureau of Conservation and Environmental Science; the Center for Alcohol Studies; the Urban Studies Center; the longstanding Co-operative Extension Service; the General Extension Division, which has recently organized a new Bureau of Community Services; the Institute of Management and Labor Relations, now fairly well assimilated to general extension; and various other agencies. The ability to create distinctive structures to perform a variety of services not readily conducted within the traditional framework contributes wholesomely to the versatility of the university if it is exercised with care. The usefulness of such agencies, however, depends upon their ability to draw on and contribute to the university's total capacity for relating to its changing environment. Harmonious cooperation between extension or service units and other departments is made difficult by differences in qualifications, career lines, and outlook of personnel, because effective extension must employ some people with competences and backgrounds somewhat different from those of traditional academia. This poses problems of internal politics and management for which few universities are as yet adequately structured.

This century has seen the invention of an increasing variety of corporate arrangements for performing public or quasi-public functions. The Port of New York Authority, the Rand Corporation, Comsat, and local anti-poverty community action corporations illustrate the adaptability of the corporate device to different purposes and different mixes of public and private interests. In this era of institutional invention, universities are learning to deal with the world of action in new ways with and through various corporate forms. Thus, the Urban Studies Center at Rutgers was instrumental, in collaboration with the Newark city and school governments and other voluntary organizations, in creating a new non-profit corporation with the Dean of Rutgers University Law School as chairman, which is now the community action corporation for the City of Newark. In an entirely different area, also sparked by the poverty program, two professional schools at Rutgers have had sub-contracts with a private electronics corporation which received the prime contract to conduct the venturesome educational experiment known as the Job Corps at Camp Kilmer. Universities are finding that they can sometimes pool resources for pioneer research and teaching by organizing a consortium. These developments should receive more systematic study in order to determine how they can be best used to help universities surmount old institutional and ideological barriers.

More and more, universities are being led into new kinds of contact with the world of action through their students, sometimes on the initiative of the students themselves, sometimes on that of the university or a member of its staff. Just as professors have been escaping from the classroom and the campus, so students, in the pursuit of their education, are getting out into the field or seeking to bring social or public issues to the campus. Of course there never was a time when the campus was truly isolated, but except in times of war there probably has not been a time in our history when there was such a fluid relationship between the campus and the world around it. This is partly attributable, no doubt, to the increasing number of students attending urban-based institutions, many of them commuting from home or living off campus. It is also doubtless attributable to the increasing democratization of higher education, with the resultant loss of the more or less exclusive or class character of the student body.

Be that as it may, this development is of immense significance to the university teaching role in relation to social change. The Peace Corps, the civil rights movement, the wars on the ghetto and on poverty are all furnishing new opportunities for relating the classroom to the field. The students engaged in New York and other cities during the summer and during the school term in work-study projects will never be the same and neither will the classrooms to which they return. Some of these extramural activities are being conducted on a strictly volunteer basis or with limited support from the universities themselves; others, like the work-study program, are financed by the government; others are backed by foundations. For example, in August, the Ford Foundation announced a grant to Radcliffe College for an experimental student internship in domestic and foreign anti-poverty service, and another to the Y.W.C.A. for a summer internship program for college students in the Chicago area in anti-poverty and urban problem work.

One difficulty with this type of activity is that if it is to be properly exploited from an educational point of view, it will put more, not fewer burdens on university faculties. The present acute shortage of teachers, accentuated as it is by new socially motivated programs and the chronic shortage of money in university budgets, encourages increasing use of inexperienced teachers for undergraduate instruction and the attempt to stretch the range of the voice of the master by electronic devices. In the long run, I believe we will discover that these methods have limited, if not altogether negative value, and that teaching geared to the exigencies of social change in the future will require more and better teachers per student, rather than fewer and less well trained ones. Hopefully, the ability to meet this requirement should be one of the most valuable by-products of an age of affluence and technology able to release more people for such high level service activities as education in all its branches.

Let me now, by way of partial summary and emphasis, ment on a few matters of high and urgent obligation. The universities, recognizing the strength of their peculiar position in American society, should act with confidence and without undue contentiousness to maintain their institutional integrity and freedom of expression and maneuver.

At the same time, universities must respond to legitimate demands for service to a society struggling to understand, to live with, and to give some rational and humane direction to change. If they do so respond, they can, I believe, command increasingly generous support not simply for ad hoc projects or for intellectual vindication for emergency action, but for the institutional strength required to guide a society dependent upon complex, fast moving technology.

This, as I have said before, requires the institutions to be in constant contact with the action, yet sufficiently apart from the control of it to maintain a degree of independence and ability for objective criticism and evaluation.

One of the most acute needs of our society at this juncture is for a crash program to increase the supply of trained and sophisticated manpower in many professional and leadership categories. The more we try to step up action to meet the demands of ongoing change that is of crisis proportions, the more prone we are to initiate a variety of enterprises that tend to compete for support and to cannibalize one another for talent. I therefore repeat the suggestion that we should inject more deliberate, less frantic planning into the effort to deal with change and make whatever allocation of resources may be necessary to ensure that first things get done first.

In order to provide a sound basis for such planned and programmed use of resources, universities should take the lead in making a continuing assessment of the unmet and emerging intellectual needs of the society. This assessment should attempt to identify the most critical research and educational requirements and put them in some rational order of importance, timing, and feasibility.

This, of course, is no task for a single university. It warrants the early bringing together of key people from different universities and from other institutions in the knowledge business to develop a plan and strategy for such an assessment and for the formulation of guidelines for governmental and other agencies offering support for research and teaching.

If universities are to establish their capacity to play the optimum role in post-urban society, many of them must make some substantial administrative and procedural changes. These changes should provide for: (1) putting the process of self-criticism on a continuing basis; (2) instituting internal arrangements that will enable them to take a stronger position in shaping both inter- and extra-university relationships; and (3) establishing one or more centers for social experimentation and information.

Let me elaborate on the third point. Such centers would need to have core staffs sufficiently large, interdisciplinary, and talented to devise and to assist in testing new research and teaching programs and sufficiently endowed with uncommitted time to anticipate emerging needs, to dream far out dreams, and yet to be ready on occasion to turn their talents to meeting immediate emergencies.

If universities are to have the knowledge necessary to help men live well in the future, they must pay much more attention than they have heretofore to the study of the future. It is more comforting to study the past, however flimsy some of the sources may be, but the science fiction writers of today and the utopians and prophets of the past have demonstrated that the future is not quite so tightly closed a book as cautious scholars have often liked to claim. To be sure, we have for some time been trying to order many of our affairs by more or less straight-line economic and social projections, and we have often been caught up short by an unexpected hiatus or turn in the trend. Caution is clearly indicated, but caution in this case indicates investment of more effort and sophistication in the enterprise, not abandonment of it.

Early in the New Deal period, Charles A. Beard, with an attitude of some surprise, wrote a book entitled, The Future Comes. I think a little later Professor Beard was not quite so sure how much future had come or how well he liked what he had seen. But his book was a portent. The future did come with an unaccustomed rush in the 1930's. It now keeps on coming at an ever faster pace and with increasing impact.

As we study the future, we can, at the very least, make much more systematic and accurate probings of the probable social consequences of scientific and technological developments and of the social side effects of social programs designed primarily to meet a particular objective or solve a particular problem. As Professor Morrison of M.I.T. in his new book, Men, Machines and Modern Times, has suggested, we should be an "experimental society." The profit motive in American industry and our national penchant for action as the sovereign remedy for all ills lead us, without thinking, to create new conditions for ourselves for which we are totally unprepared. Professor Morrison, therefore, suggests, and I commend the suggestion to our universities as well as to our governments, that whenever possible we test the effects of new machines or techniques in comparable experimental situations to find out not only how they work in a technical sense, but also how they work on people and how people react to them.

Unless modern man is incredibly foolish, most of his future and his satisfaction with life on earth is ahead of him. The exploration and conquest of the future should be not only his greatest adventure, but also the object of his most intensive study and reflection.

EDUCATING THE URBAN STUDENT FOR THE URBAN WAY OF LIFE

by

Charles V. Willie

Willie deals with the role of the university in educating students to be citizens and leaders in our urbanized society. He sees urbanization as being different from, though related to, industrialization, and he sees distinct differences in the social and educational responses needed to deal with them. While industrialization, the main focus of our social and educational institutions, requires technological skills for work, urbanization requires the development of a sense of community. Willie believes that the university must seek to educate leaders from and for all levels of community—partly because all levels of community need leaders and partly because truth comes only from the fusion of a number of viewpoints—and that university education must become involved with current controversial community issues. The university must "teach activists the benefits of reasoned thought and thinkers the methods and techniques of effective action."

Charles V. Willie, Associate Professor of Sociology at Syracuse University, is presently a visiting lecturer at the Harvard University Medical School. He is also Senior Research Associate at Syracuse's Youth Development Center and Director of the Community Seminar. Dr. Willie has served on the New York State Mental Health Commission and the State Committee for the 1961 White House Conference on Aging. He is consultant to the National Urban Program of the Episcopal Church and is active in numerous human rights and urban affairs groups.

EDUCATING THE URBAN STUDENT FOR THE URBAN WAY OF LIFE

In the United States, urbanization, higher education, and continuing education are coming of age together. A little more than ten years ago, 2.7 million people were enrolled in institutions of higher education. Today this number has doubled. By 1975 it is estimated that a majority of the adults over twenty-five will have been graduated from high school. Many of them will attend our colleges and universities as part-time as well as full-time students. A survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago in 1961-62 discovered that nearly 29 million people were engaged in some kind of adult education course.[1] This figure was about 16 per cent of the estimated 1961 national population and represented no small achievement since the main growth in adult education, as pointed out by Jerome Ziegler, is a twentieth-century development.[2]

The urbanization statistics for this century, during which the United States shifted from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urban population, are no less astounding. The 1920 Census was the first that recorded the majority of the residents of this nation as living in urban areas. Today more than 70 per cent of the people live in urban and suburban communities.

The increasing urbanization of the United States along with the expanding numbers involved in continuing education means that a major concern of the present and future must be one of equipping our students to deal with the urban community. Dealing with the urban *community* is different from dealing with the urban industrial world of work. In her book on *The City*, Rose Hum Lee states, "The most pronounced change in urban living and environment followed the Industrial Revolution." She points out that "in Western societies, urbanization and industrialization are generally associated with each other."[3] Because of this association, we have focused many of our studies of contemporary problems upon the division of labor and specialization so characteristic of the urbanized industrial society; and many of our educational and training programs have been designed to teach people the occupational skills necessary to find work in the urbanized industrial society.

---

[1] Jerome M. Ziegler, "Continuing Education in the University," *Daedalus*, 93 (Fall, 1964), p. 1162.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Rose Hum Lee, *The City* (Chicago: J. B. Lippincott, 1955), p. 7.

But in addition to the changes in work preparation brought about by industrialization, there are also the changes in relationships among people and between people and their social environment brought about by urbanization. Three decades ago, sociologist Louis Wirth of the University of Chicago wrote a famous essay entitled, "Urbanism as a Way of Life." He recognized that the major problems of survival in the urban society are not limited to circumstances of work. He pointed out this simple but profound fact: "Increasing the number of inhabitants in a settlement beyond a certain limit will affect the relationships between them and the character of the city."[4] Wirth indicated the dimension of the urbanized industrial society to which our attention must be turned today; and that dimension is the nature of the interaction between large heterogeneous masses of people who occupy a limited geographic area. In the United States, for example, Charles Abrams informs us that "about 70 per cent of the . . . population is now concentrated in . . . communities occupying . . . only a little more than one per cent of the nation's land area."[5] The population of our cities is, of course, pluralistic. This means that in urban areas there is intense interaction among people of diversified interests and backgrounds who are uncontrolled by the "bonds of kinship, of neighborliness, and the sentiments arising out of living together for generations under a common folk tradition."[6]

If our continuing education is to be in line with the needs of the contemporary situation—that is, if we are to help our students fulfill themselves in the urbanized industrial society—we must educate each student for life in a pluralistic community. We must teach our students how to develop a sense of community among heterogeneous and diversified people. At the World Conference on Church and Society in Switzerland held during the summer of 1966, economist Barbara Ward said we must develop some kind of community if we are to get out of the present world situation alive. The same statement may be made of the local urban setting. The rioting, ransacking, and rebelling that occurred in city after city during the summer of 1966 were preventable, just as preventable as the explosions and eruptions that characterized labor-management relations twenty-five to fifty years ago. The work in industrialization by units of our major universities like Harvard Business School contributed in no small way to the peaceful evolution of a sense of community between labor and management, particularly with reference to production.[7] In a like manner, it is appropriate that the society turn to the university and its various programs like continuing education for assistance in dealing with the disruptions of these days.

---

[4] Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," in Paul K. Hatt and Albert J. Reiss (eds.), Reader in Urban Sociology (New York: The Free Press, 1951), pp. 38-39. (Originally published in the American Journal of Sociology.)

[5] Charles Abrams, "The Uses of Land in Cities," in Scientific American (ed.), Cities (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), p. 123.

[6] Wirth, op. cit., p. 39.

Thus far, our universities and particularly their continuing education programs have been slow to respond to the pressing need to develop a sense of community in the urbanized industrial society. In spite of the human relations crisis that has been rampaging throughout our cities since the 1954 Supreme Court decision outlawing officially sanctioned racial segregation in public education, the 1961-62 National Opinion Research Center Survey revealed that nearly 40 per cent of the subject matter offered by universities and colleges to enrollees in continuing education may be classified as vocational; approximately another 40 per cent is in the area of general education; and only 4 per cent is concerned with public affairs.[8] This means that our continuing education programs are still concerned with urban man as worker. We are continuing to understand urbanization as if it were synonymous with industrialization and are not offering courses related to the larger responsibilities required of our students who live in cities.

The fact that so little of the subject matter of continuing education deals with public affairs and contemporary social problems has prompted some authorities in higher education to conclude that "adults avoid the study of critical issues."[9] It should remain an open question, however, whether this low proportion of courses represents avoidance on the part of our students to become involved in the critical and controversial affairs of our time or avoidance on the part of educational institutions. It is always easier to attribute these deficiencies to individuals rather than to institutions. It is like calling those students with special needs whom our high schools are unwilling to accommodate "dropouts" rather than "pushouts," or like labeling those troublesome clients whom social service agencies cannot tolerate as "uncooperative."[10]

---

[7] See Elton Mayo, Human Relations in an Industrial Civilization (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933); and F. J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, Management and the Worker (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939).

[8] Ziegler, op. cit., p. 1175.

[9] Ibid., p. 1176.

In the past, we concentrated our efforts on changing the student in his relationship with himself. We provided information and taught the student certain skills which were designed to contribute to self-improvement. Now we must do more! We must provide our students with the information and teach them the kinds of skills which may contribute to societal improvement. After two world wars and several other lesser wars, we now know that good individuals do not automatically give rise to good societies. There were many good individuals in Nazi Germany during the period when millions of Jews were murdered by the state. There were many good individuals in the United States during the time when loyal Japanese-Americans were uprooted from their West Coast homes in the early 1940's and detained in relocation camps, like prisoners, by the state. We cannot develop a sense of community by limiting our concern to self-improvement. The vocational and general educational emphases of the past are too narrow. These approaches may have been sufficient for the beginning centuries of this land, but they are inadequate as we move toward the year 2000.

Now can we develop a sense of community by limiting our concern to developing only the elite. Our students, especially those who participate in continuing education, are urban and diversified. Consider, both from the point of view of educational content and from that of the composition of the student body, the purpose of Harvard as stated in the 1650 Charter: "The advancement of all good literature, arts and science." These were the skills considered to be necessary for learned leaders, clergymen, and statesmen.[11] Unlike those in the past, however, today's learned leaders are not limited to clergymen and statesmen, and neither are they all from the upper social class. Our colleges and universities are still places for training and educating leaders. But the demand today placed upon institutions of higher learning for the public good is to seek out and educate all sorts of leaders—those in the upper, middle, and lower classes—and to teach them to become ceaselessly involved in public affairs.

---

[10] Charles V. Willie, "Deprivation and Alienation: A Compound Situation," in C. W. Hunnicutt (ed.), Urban Education and Cultural Deprivation (Syracuse: University Division of Summer Sessions, 1964), p. 89.

[11] The President and Fellows of Harvard College, The Story of Harvard, A Short History (Cambridge: The University Information Center, 1966), p. 3.

This, of course, is not easy for educators. You may recall the little volume by W. Lloyd Warner and his colleagues entitled, Who Shall Be Educated? The authors of that book point out that becoming a teacher is one way of becoming upwardly mobile in the stratification hierarchy of the community. They further indicate that because teachers have in effect used education as a vehicle of upward mobility, they almost insist that their students do likewise.

If the university is an institution which is searching for truth, it is a distinct advantage to have a diversified student body in all programs; for truth emerges out of the clashing of ideas. Plato believed that philosophers should rule the state because of the union of qualities they possessed, the most important of which was their love for truth. But Plato erred in thinking that truth is an inherent quality of the philosopher. It may be that the pursuit of truth is a fundamental and inherent quality of the philosopher, but the possession of truth is not. The pursuit of truth may be a fundamental quality of any learned leader—be he rich or poor; but the possession of truth is not.

In Book VI of the Republic, Plato said, "[Philosophers] will never intentionally receive into their mind falsehood."[12] But Rashōmon, the Japanese film, provides another perspective on this business of truth. It is not that one intentionally caters to falsehood, but rather that each person's version of truth is conditioned by his own station in life, his image of himself, his experiences in the past, and his aspirations for the future. This means that no one, whether saint or sinner, philosopher or fool, can fully know the truth because the knowledge which anyone possesses is always conditioned by the uniqueness of the being who possesses it and limited by his perspective. A university which is actively searching for truth should be actively attracting all kinds of persons into its various programs.

---

[12] J. D. Kaplan (ed.), Dialogues of Plato, Jowett translation (New York: Pocket Book, 1951), pp. 347-48.

If the university is in the business of educating leaders, it must deliberately include among its students leaders from the slums and leaders from the suburbs. It is necessary to recruit a diversified student body because we know that students learn from each other as well as from their teachers and that the truth which they learn will emerge out of the competition of the ideas, images, and aspirations of the multitude. Each leader partially defines truth in terms of his present and past experiences. We who have specialized in teaching the white and middle class only or the nonwhite and working class only have specialized in imparting half-truths to our students and have persisted in defending the circumstance in which we teach—circumstances of homogeneous people—which do not help our students to know how little they know.

Parenthetically let me acquaint you with a real community issue which demonstrates beautifully how one's assessment of success or failure is associated with one's station in life and the perspective with which he evaluates life's circumstances. In Syracuse, New York, in 1964, the Board of Education transferred fifty to sixty Negro children from an inner-city elementary school with a predominantly nonwhite population to a predominantly white elementary school in a middle-class neighborhood. The president of the school board, who is white, Protestant, and a captain of industry, said in testimony at a hearing of the United States Civil Rights Commission that he was in favor of the bussing program because he now is convinced that programs of compensatory education are not very effective in schools in ghetto areas. In effect, he considered the bussing plan to be a success. Obviously, the president of the school board values high achievement and believes that white children who experience education in privileged settings have a responsibility to share these experiences with persons who have experienced more disadvantaged circumstances. His expression fundamentally was the ethic of the dominant majority.

Because of this ethic, the president of the Syracuse Board of Education opposed the bussing of white children into predominantly Negro inner-city schools that had over-all lower achievement ratings. When in 1966 sufficient pressure was brought upon the school board to equalize the burden of bussing by proposing an integration plan for an inner-city school with a predominantly Negro student body, the school board agreed to sponsor a plan to bus white children into one inner-city school and to increase the extra services in that school only if enough white children volunteered so that they in fact would be a majority. The plan was approached without enthusiasm and the public campaign to recruit white students to transfer to the inner-city school was delayed until only three weeks before the opening of school. The Board of Education authorized the staff of the public school system to recruit at least seven hundred white students. Because of the circumstances under which the project was launched, only sixty-eight white children signed up. This means they would have been a minority in the inner-city school for the 1966-67 school year. However, the president of the school board stated that the program was a failure and the plan to bus white children into the inner-city school was canceled.

My assessment of the program was quite different. My own background has been that of a minority person who was educated in ghetto public schools that were inadequately equipped and staffed. While the circumstances of life for members of a minority population may be disadvantaged from one perspective, they are advantaged from another perspective. To persevere in the face of great adversity, the members of a "disadvantaged" minority must develop courage. To share limited resources with others and with the community-at-large, the members of a "disadvantaged" minority must learn generosity. But most of all, the members of a "disadvantaged" minority must learn the humility of receiving. The development of courage, humility, and generosity are but a few advantages that flow from being a member of the "disadvantaged" minority. These characteristics might well benefit members of the advantaged majority. Courage, humility, and generosity are good lessons to learn. My entire life has been devoted to trying to master these lessons, though not very well. Sixty-eight white children who volunteered to become members of a minority in a disadvantaged inner-city school could have begun these lessons in the fall of 1966. But the Board of Education canceled the opportunity.

When fifty to sixty Negro children volunteered to attend a predominantly white school, the president of the school board considered that program to be a success. But when sixty to seventy white children volunteered to attend a predominantly Negro school, the president of the school board considered that program to be a failure. The numbers involved in the two programs were about the same, but the perspective of the board president varied according to the situation and his values and position in life. In the 1964 integration experience, white students continued as a majority, but in the 1966 integration experience white students would have become a minority.

In terms of the station in life which I have occupied and the perspective that I bring, there are advantages in living the life of a minority. I considered the 1966 program to be a success which would have exposed sixty-eight white children to these "advantages." I am not suggesting, however, that my assessment of the situation is right and that the assessment of the president of the school board is wrong. Each of us possesses partial truths based upon our limited view of reality from the perspective of our particular station in life. The truth will emerge only when our differing assessments have an opportunity to encounter each other in open competition.

Our colleges and universities have accepted the fact that their students come from all walks of life. Clark Kerr attributes the tremendous increases in our enrollment to the demise of two long-held notions: "that higher education ought to be restricted to a small elite . . . , and that only a small percentage of a country's population is capable of benefiting from some kind of higher education."[13] You may recall the famous statement by President Charles Van Hise of the University of Wisconsin in 1906 when he said that he was organizing the General Extension Division so that "the boundaries of the university campus [would become] coterminous with the boundaries of the state." Ziegler's review of the development of adult education in the United States identifies this as a significant policy statement because it meant that the university had committed itself to serve all people with university-level courses and not just those persons who were able to enroll on the main campus because of financial resources or geographic proximity.[14] It should go without saying that continuing education has sort of reneged on this starry-eyed beginning. While continuing education has extended the influence of colleges and universities far and wide, it has tended to educate people to fulfill the needs of the Establishment.

---

[13] Clark Kerr, "The Frantic Race to Remain Contemporary," Daedalus, 93 (Fall, 1964), p. 1056.

[14] Ziegler, op. cit., p. 1156.

Since urban students come from varied circumstances and stations in life, it is incumbent upon colleges and universities, and especially upon their continuing education programs, to equip these students to become leaders in whatever situations they find themselves. We must teach the urban student how to lead his friends into the mainstream of community life, contributing whatever is uniquely their own—be they upper, middle, or lower class.

That the development of leadership is still an unmet need in our society is revealed by a statement by the Reverend Arthur L. Whitaker, Negro Baptist clergyman in Rochester, New York. He was shaken by the rioting in that city July 24, 25, and 26 in 1964, and said that the potential for violent outbreak will remain as long as there is a tendency of both Negroes and whites to look for a black messiah as leader and spokesman for all Negroes. "In a complex society such as ours," the Reverend Mr. Whitaker continued, "there can be no single leader for any group. There are various levels of leadership in all groups." It would seem to me that colleges and universities ought to be training leaders for all levels. This means that colleges and universities may continue a practice which they are very capable of performing. What is new is that they should train leaders of all levels and not just leaders for the Establishment.

We have strongly asserted that the education of leaders of all socioeconomic status levels is a major responsibility of our colleges and universities because truth and justice, which are essential in a community, tend to emerge from the adversary system in which all categories of people can effectively confront each other. We cannot expect one sector of society to be continuously concerned about the interests of other sectors. Even the most understanding and compassionate view the needs of others from their own vantage point. It is a limitation of our finite humanity that we cannot put ourselves in another person's position.

The specialization and division of labor which characterize the urban setting literally mean that one person or category of persons must do for another what the other cannot do for himself or itself. People of the urban community are truly interdependent. In the past, the poor and some occupational, racial, sex, and age categories have been cut off from the mainstream of community life. This has limited their opportunity for personal fulfillment and has eliminated from the social life of the total community the enriching contribution of their full participation. Colleges and universities must deliberately develop programs in leadership training for all categories of people, including those who are "in" and those who are "out." No longer can efforts be limited to training leaders for the Establishment only. The health of the community depends upon the full and effective participation of all of its sectors.

This means that continuing education must become involved with current controversial community issues, not so much to share particular truths as to ensure that adversaries are adequately equipped with the skills necessary for honest deliberation. It is out of such deliberations that the truth may emerge. The alternative to becoming involved in current community controversy is to withdraw.

Peterson's study, A Hundred Years of Education, indicates what happens when colleges and universities withdraw. They tend to decline in stature. Peterson determined that during the eighteenth century university life reached its lowest point of decline in Germany, France, and England. The chief complaint was that "the University had preserved a 'medieval' form which was completely out of touch with the needs of [a] new [century]."[15]

In a 1964 Commencement Address, Julius A. Stratton, who was at that time president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, made his peace with the need to become involved. He said, "I do not believe that we can escape the responsibility of taking part in the solution of problems which touch most deeply upon the total welfare of the society."[16] On October 7, 1966, a new president of M. I. T., Howard W. Johnson, was installed. This is what he said in his Installation Address: "The historic roles of the university—to educate youth, to preserve knowledge, and to create new knowledge—remain the same; but the emphasis on them becomes greater in a more demanding society, and the greatest emphasis will be on developing leadership." He spoke of leaders who will be concerned with service to society, service in the cause of society, and the well-being of their fellow man. He said further that students would come closer to understanding man's purpose on this earth by seeking to serve their fellows. The new president of this school has stated his belief that "the general range of problems attacked by M. I. T. in the future will shift more and more to those that understandably affect the ways in which our society lives." He said that while science would remain a central concern, "it would be inadequate for the basic education of the M. I. T. man to stop at science and engineering." Johnson went on to say that the institute "will increasingly exert its power towards problems of human significance."[17] I have deliberately quoted two presidents of Massachusetts Institute of Technology because this is an educational center that has become famous around the world for teaching students how to deal with people as well as things.

---

[15] A. D. C. Peterson, A Hundred Years of Education (New York: Collier Books, 1962), p. 199. (Originally published in 1952.)

[16] Julius A. Stratton, "Commencement Address, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, June 12, 1964," Daedalus, 93 (Fall, 1964), p. 1143.

There are few teachers and administrators of colleges and universities who would disagree with these statements made by the M. I. T. presidents. Thus the basic question is not, "Should institutions of higher learning become involved in current controversial community affairs?" It is rather, "How should such institutions become involved in current controversial community affairs?"

The kind of reaction that may be anticipated as colleges and universities move in earnest into the business of educating all levels of community leaders is shown by the experience of University College, the adult education division of Syracuse University. Of the several programs pertaining to community leadership development, two are especially pertinent: (1) the Thursday Breakfast Roundtable and (2) the Community Action Training Center. These two programs were initiated during the 1964-65 school year. The first program has continued to operate; the second has been dropped.

The Thursday Breakfast Roundtable is limited to men and has included businessmen, prominent lawyers, high governmental officers, executives of major community associations such as the Community Chest and the Chamber of Commerce, a few professors with demonstrated interest in public affairs, and some outstanding clergymen. The roundtable is a public service provided by University College as a continuing channel of communication for civic leaders in the Syracuse metropolitan area. The weekly informal meetings represent an opportunity for men sharing special responsibilities for the progressive development of the community to exchange ideas and opinions on important public issues and problems. The program begins at 8:30 A.M. and ends promptly at 9:30 A.M. The support which the Thursday Breakfast Roundtable has received in the community is indicated by the kinds of people who have consented to address the group. At one session, the mayor of Syracuse discussed "Our Major Strengths and Weaknesses, as Seen from City Hall." At another, the county executive of Onondaga County, which surrounds and includes the city of Syracuse, spoke on public health. Distinguished lawyers—heads of voluntary and public bodies—foundation executives, and other top community leaders participate in these weekly sessions.

---

[17] Boston Globe (Evening Edition), October 7, 1966, p. 1.

In effect, the Thursday Breakfast Roundtable brings together the local Establishment for the purpose of sharing and exchanging views, hopefully for the benefit of the total community. At the end of the 1964-65 school year, one local daily newspaper published an editorial declaring that the enterprise was a success and expressing the hope that it would continue. And so the roundtable has continued, reaching out to top community leaders and involving them in a public affairs educational venture.

The other program, the Community Action Training Center, began at University College in the same year. A publication describing the program states the following:

> We are seeking candidates who, on the basis of existing knowledge, are likely to enter long careers of organization of low income populations. They should be young, responsible, committed to hard work for seven days a week, including evenings, in the field. They should, if possible, be from low income areas themselves and able to identify with and be accepted by most people in neighborhoods of poverty, and not be perceived as deviant by the general population.
>
> Applicants should have a controlled, but intense anger about continued injustice and should be committed to hard work for people who are grappling with apparently overwhelming problems. They should be able to plan and act over a long period of time in the development of democratic organizations with enough power to alter the corrosive condition of living in poverty.
>
> They will need to put neighborhood issues ahead of personal concerns and to be enablers to the development of organizations, instead of themselves assuming leadership roles in the organization which is created. . . .
>
> In practice, trainees will have varying levels of education ranging from those with relatively few years of school to students in the Graduate School of Social Work. . . .

> There will be no academic prerequisites. A certificate will be issued to each graduate by University College, the adult education division of Syracuse University.

From the descriptive material presented above, it is clear that University College was serious in its attempt to develop leadership programs for those who are "in" and those who are "out," and for people at all levels of the socio-economic status hierarchy, including both the poor and the affluent. While a local newspaper praised the Thursday Breakfast Roundtable, the morning daily paper damned the Community Action Training Center. It called the federal grant which financed the center "a strange misuse of public funds." The project was strange to the editorial writers for the local newspaper (1) because the field work unit of the Community Action Training Center was organizing "beneficiaries of public housing to protest because they are not getting more assistance"; and (2) because of the kinds of students recruited and their "lack of academic prerequisities."[18]

The Community Action Training Center upset the local Establishment. The mayor didn't like it, and made the existence of the center one of his campaign issues. The Syracuse Housing Authority didn't like it, and one of its members wrote a letter to President Lyndon B. Johnson signifying his alarm over the involvement of the federal government in a program designed to train "agitators" for the poor. Some businessmen didn't like it and canceled their pledges to the university's fund drive. Several local citizens, including the mayor, waited upon the chancellor of Syracuse University and made known their complaints. Finally, the federal grant supporting the Community Action Training Center terminated and was not renewed.

This first major effort by a major university of leadership development among the poor should not be viewed as a failure. There were some errors in the way the over-all program, especially its field work unit, was structured into the total university. Also, there were some errors in the style of operating. These errors probably were due to the absence of past experience on which to base this new program. As colleges and universities become more committed to educating leaders for all levels of society, they will build upon the Syracuse experience and eventually become more successful. So the demise of the Community Action Training Center at University College could be classified as a failure; more appropriately, I think, the demise should be classified as an early event in a series which will evolve eventually into an enlarged conception of leadership training among our colleges and universities. The brief existence of the Community Action Training Center, within a university setting, confronted institutions of higher learning with the fact that they have a responsibility for training leaders of the poor as well as of the affluent, of those in the slums as well as of those in the suburbs. In due time, I predict, they will find ways of fulfilling this responsibility on a continuing basis as a new educational service for a pluralistic and urban society.

---

[18] Post Standard, editorial, "Wanted: Angry Young Agitators," April 21, 1965.

The general lines of a reconciliation between the old education and the new became clearer to me during a sentimental journey I recently took. On February 18, 1966, I returned to my alma mater to deliver the ninety-ninth-year Founders' Day Banquet Address. My wife and children accompanied me to Morehouse College, a school with a relatively small student body of men, predominantly Negro, from which I graduated in 1948. Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president of the college more than twenty years ago when I first enrolled, was present, as well as many of the old faculty members.

It was a joy to return to Morehouse College to experience the old setting, but more importantly, to sense its new spirit. I tried to capture some of that new spirit in the Founders' Day Address because I believe it is the spirit which all universities and colleges must have if they are effectively to educate the urban student for the urban way of life.

I spoke of college-community relations as "an increasingly difficult problem" for administrators during this age of demonstrations. I called the deep involvement of some colleges and universities in the onrushing affairs of the community "a challenge to their former status as places set aside for contemplation." I saw my alma mater going into its second century with the conflict in goals—whether college should be a place for creative thinking or social action—unresolved. And because of this unresolved problem, I felt that the school would endure. It has exalted students who protested and acclaimed the scholarly and contemplative.

Morehouse College has nurtured Julian Bond, who was denied a seat, to which he was elected, in the Georgia legislature because of his views opposing United States involvement in the war in Vietnam; it has also nurtured Dr. James Nabrit of the American delegation to the United Nations, who shares the responsibility of defending the administration and its policy of war in Vietnam. Among other outstanding graduates are the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who daringly demonstrates in the city streets, and Judge Robert Franklin, who soberly presides over the Toledo city courts. It seemed to me that my alma mater was involved with mankind. To borrow a phrase from Langston Hughes, I saw Morehouse College all caught up in "the sweet flypaper of life."[19]

I predicted that with this breadth of involvement in the community, Morehouse College would move into the second century of its existence continuing to support all of its sons, including those who debate and those who demonstrate. But more than this, I felt that my alma mater would "strive to impart to the activists the benefits of reasoned thought, and to the thinkers the methods and techniques of effective action."[20]

That prediction is a call to all colleges and universities that dare to read aright the signs of the time. If they are to prepare their students for life and leadership in an urbanized, industrialized, pluralistic society, they must teach activists the benefits of reasoned thought and thinkers the methods and techniques of effective action. Only then will students become ceaselessly involved in public affairs and caught up in "the sweet flypaper of life" which, to say the least, is a bit sticky and, some might even say, rather messy.

---

[19] Roy DeCarava and Langston Hughes, The Sweet Flypaper of Life (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955), p. 92.

[20] Charles V. Willie, "Into the Second Century: Problems of Higher Education of Particular Concern to Morehouse College," Morehouse College Bulletin, XXV (Spring, 1966), pp. 7-10.

NOTES AND ESSAYS ON EDUCATION FOR ADULTS **54**

THE CONTINUING TASK

Reflections on Purpose
In Higher Continuing Education

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

PUBLICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- Robert F. Campbell, *Clark University*
- James T. Carey, *University of California*
- John P. Dyer, *Tulane University*
- Cyril O. Houle, *University of Chicago*
- H. Lichtenstein, *Hofstra College*
- Jack London, *University of California*
- Ernest E. McMahon, *Rutgers University*
- Russell F. W. Smith, *New York University*
- Alan M. Thomas, *Canadian Association for Adult Education*
- Clifford L. Winters, *Syracuse University*

CENTER PUBLICATIONS

Center publications on education of adults include the *Notes and Essays* series examining purposes and philosophy, *Reports* on methods and practices in the field, *Research Reports*, and *Occasional Papers*.

For a complete list and prices write:

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS *AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY*
138 Mountfort St.
Brookline, Mass. 02146

$1.50

THE CONTINUING TASK

Reflections on Purpose
In Higher Continuing Education

CYRIL O. HOULE
Professor, Department of Education
University of Chicago

GORDON W. BLACKWELL
President, Furman University

HORACE M. KALLEN
Professor, The New School

JAMES B. WHIPPLE
Associate Director
Center for The Study of Liberal Education for Adults

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**
at Boston University

THE CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS** was established in 1951 by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with universities seeking to initiate or improve programs of liberal education for adults. In 1964 CSLEA affiliated with Boston University. The purpose of the Center is to help American higher education institutions develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults.

Copyright 1967 by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

PREFACE

The title piece in this collection is The Continuing Task. It represents the enduring concerns for liberal education of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults and of the constituency with which it works. The papers were all delivered at the fifteenth annual leadership conference of the Center in Boston in March, 1967. Since their inception in 1952, these conferences have continually concerned themselves with liberal education as related to significant sources of educational direction—to aspects of the social mileu, the academic community, the individual learner, and the demands of profession.

In 1952, at the first of these conferences, discussions began on the relationship of the evening college to its social mileu and to its parent organization, the university. As a result of this discussion, the theme of the 1953 AUEC[1] annual convention was formulated as: The Purposes of the Evening College. The task at that time was to consider how the evening college can relate to liberal education in the light of the needs of the community, the needs of the individual, and the dictates of the academic tradition.

Three men, whose papers appear in this current volume, had also presented papers in 1953.[2] Gordon W. Blackwell had discussed the nature of the community as general background for understanding the university's role in community development. Horace M. Kallen had entered a plea for keeping the individual and his needs paramount as we developed programs in the evening college. Cyril O. Houle had reminded us that we could best fulfill our obligations to the individual and the community by preserving some portion of our busy professional lives for helping the evening college grow and develop in its human purpose.

When planning the fifteenth annual leadership conference as an anniversary celebration, the Center staff thought it would be fruitful to bring these three men back to view the task of higher continuing education from a 1967 perspective. Accordingly, Gordon Blackwell was asked to deal again with the question of community. This time he points out to us that the American scene is in ferment, that higher education is functioning in a milieu which is primarily urban, and that the university must reorganize its continuing education activities to meet constantly changing needs. This means that the university is more directly geared to social action than it was fifteen years ago, and that it has entered into a creative partnership with such other forces as government, private industry, and civic organizations.

---

[1] Association of University Evening Colleges.

[2] These papers were collected and reprinted along with a fourth paper by Earl J. McGrath in CSLEA Occasional Papers, No. 13. Dr. McGrath was unable to return for the 1967 conference because of a prior commitment.

Horace Kallen, observing the present scene, and also looking to the future, sees our present era as an age of anxiety in which the wonders of today foretell an uncertain tomorrow. This condition of our lives underscores the awesome need for a new meaning to liberal education and for an education which liberates the individual to be free and teaches him to learn and think and act anew.

In 1967, Cyril Houle points out that university adult educators have come a long way toward understanding their craft and developing an imaginative concern for integrating individual and group needs in the light of the current milieu and current social issues. More secure in craft, today's practitioner is on his way to developing a genuine professional image as a man of action who looks upon every activity as an adventure and who subjects action to theoretical scrutiny.

At this fifteenth anniversary time, we see a growth of profession, a new understanding of the urban milieu, and a continuing challenge to those who seek the liberation of individuals. In the title piece in this volume, James B. Whipple summarizes the present situation as one in which the university, in an anxious age, continues to be confronted with anti-liberal forces. He reminds us that the most important continuing task of concerned craftsmen and professionals in the field of higher continuing education is the continuing development of liberal education programs. The continuing task for education is to create programs that are relevant to the times. Such programs, rather than being determined by expediency, are integrated into the total continuing education pattern of the individual as he learns to strengthen his ability to stand against the anti-liberal spirit.

Peter E. Siegle

CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE . . . . Peter E. Siegle iii

FROM CRAFT TOWARD PROFESSION . . . . . Cyril O. Houle 1

COMMUNITY NEEDS AND HIGHER CONTINUING EDUCATION . . . . Gordon W. Blackwell 17

THE ADULT INDIVIDUAL, HIGHER EDUCATION, AND THE FUTURE . . . . Horace M. Kallen 26

THE CONTINUING TASK . . . . James B. Whipple 41

262

FROM CRAFT TOWARD PROFESSION

Cyril O. Houle

I

We celebrate today the fifteenth anniversary of the Center. While your speakers have been instructed not to stress that fact (for reasons which will immediately become apparent), we cannot ignore this age of life which mankind ritualistically observes.

What does it mean to be fifteen? Gesell and his associates at Yale have given the definitive answer. The fifteen-year-old, they say, "has so many facets and phases that he himself at times seems muddled. . . . He also gives an impression of apathy. This impression, however, may well be erroneous, for the apparent apathy is closely related to a quiet musing preoccupation with inner states of feeling. He gives focalized attention to these subtle states," a fact which "expresses itself in new sensitivities, irritabilities, resistances, aversions, and suspicions." He is "monosyllabic and cold with a trace of hostility," "withdrawn," preoccupied with "minutiae and detail," "piecemeal and fragmentary in his immediate outlook," likely to "nurture feelings of grudge, revenge and violence," and "confused about his potentials and responsibilities."[1]

We ourselves add confirming evidence to the learned authors' belief that this is a confused and confusing time of life. For the Center, which is sixteen, is celebrating its fifteenth birthday by restaging a conference that occurred fourteen years ago.

II

My task is to begin the process of getting us through our awkward age. Let us look backward briefly to see how far we have come, to identify our major current challenge, to look more deeply into our past to see how it can help us succeed in meeting that challenge, and finally to see if that success provides any guiding principle for the future.

---

[1] Arnold Gesell, Frances L. Ilg, and Louise Bates Ames, Youth: The Years from Ten to Sixteen (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1956), pp. 214-20.

III

A social historian would say that fifteen years ago we were near the end of the great postwar era of higher adult education. In the eight previous years, the veterans had flooded our classes and our programs, had accepted (though not uncritically) almost anything that evening colleges or extension divisions offered them, and had given our campus colleagues a taste of the exhilaration which comes from teaching mature minds. But the great spate of development was near its end. We could sit back to contemplate where we were and how best to use our resources. We could look with dissatisfaction at certain evidences in our work of an excessive vocationalism and a routine lockstep training taken over from programs built for young undergraduates. It was time to consolidate our strength, to cut our losses, to establish standards of quality, and, when this was done, to move forward inventively to create the new programs required by our students and our society.

While the forward-looking nature of the present occasion makes inappropriate a lengthy inventory of the gains and losses of higher adult education in these fifteen years, we cannot confront the future without being aware of the circumstances from which it grows. An impressionistic account of a few highlights may perhaps, in a Proustian way, aid our remembrance of things past.

Extension divisions and evening colleges are larger and more numerous than they were. The concept of all-university integration of extension services has had a modest growth. Although vice-presidents for adult education were not wholly unknown in the early 1950's, we did not see as many of them around us as we do today. The idea that extension administrators should be educated for their responsibilities is more prevalent than it was. A great flowering of innovative programming has caused services which were rare or visionary fifteen years ago to be common today. Among them are special degree programs for adults, exploratory experiences in the fine arts, counseling services, programs to meet the special needs of women, advanced management training, and efforts to cope with the general or the special problems of cities. Conferences have had a particularly prodigious growth: in 1951-52, they enrolled about 400,000 people; in 1965-66, the number grew to almost 1,400,000.[2]

We have had losses, too, a few of them extremely damaging. Some universities have drastically cut their flourishing programs. Others have moved vigorously toward integrated and balanced services, only to backslide into division and disruption. A few governors, legislators, and boards of trustees have hardened their hearts against us. Yet though we grumble, we do not cry havoc. Even as we begin to tally our losses, our pencils falter, for we recognize that, in other places and other institutions, great gains are being achieved.

One evidence of greater maturity is that, in the face of adversity, we have learned to bide our time. We used to feel so raw and new that we regarded a budget cut or other attack as the sure sign that the countless prophets of our own doom were right. Now we wait out the storm, meanwhile putting ourselves in a position to move forth with strength when the weather clears. Every other part of a university waxes and wanes in its absolute and relative strengths. We have learned that our work, too, has its peaks and valleys.

IV

Where are we now? Each of us might stress some element of our present situation with pride or sorrow or hope or resignation, but about the central dominating fact, nobody could have much doubt. We are now well launched on the greatest forward surge of growth which higher adult education has ever known, more broadly based, more maturely conceived, and more universally accepted than at any time in our history. The social determinist would find no root cause to explain this growth, in the same sense that the end of a long world war created the last major thrust. We have, instead, only the maturing of many trends which, interacting together, have created widespread support for advanced forms of adult learning. The ideas of fifteen years ago have come into their own. We were prophets before our time; we have worked hard and successfully to create programs, and now we reap the reward. We sense that we are still nearer the beginning than the end of a spurt of growth whose culmination we cannot yet see.

---

[2] John R. Morton, University Extension in the United States (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1953), p. 55; Association of University Evening Colleges and National University Extension Association, Programs and Registrations; 1965-66 (Norman: University of Oklahoma, n.d.), p. 20.

McGeorge Bundy said that it would occur by 1975 when, he predicted, the greatest change wrought within the university during the previous fifteen years would be the fact that it "is not merely a place of full-time effort by young students and old professors—it is also a home, for hours, or days, or weeks at a time, of all highly civilized men."[3] This idea is held today not merely by innovators but also by those who wield power. The key officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are men who understand our point of view. In hundreds of places in the federal budget money can be found for adult education—and it is folding money, not just small change. Great industries are creating major programs of higher adult education for their own staffs and simultaneously designing new technologies of educational methods and materials. Foundations are awakening to the need to support spectacular innovations, particularly public television and the continuing education of professionals. This latter function is of great importance to us. Physicians and other workers in the health professions, lawyers, clergymen, social workers, architects, engineers, and other groups above or below that shadowy line which separates the professions from the other occupations are all concerning themselves greatly these days with how they can enlarge the ideas, conceptions, knowledge, and skills of their practicing members.

The university presidents are certainly aware of what is happening. At the recent meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the central theme was "State Universities and Public Affairs," and the idea that institutions of higher learning should move with great vigor into their communities was, on the whole, welcomed with enthusiasm. John Corson, to whom university administrators are listening with special care these days, took as the title of his address: "If Not the University?"

The ringing affirmations of community service presented by our presidents are, in fact, creating new clichés. The head of one major university (which nobody has ever considered a leader in extension) began the new year by centering his annual message on the need to "search for national solutions to the revolutions which are shaking the entire fabric of urban society." He went on to report that his own institution "is out of its ivory tower—if indeed it ever occupied one—and never before have its unique resources been so widely utilized for the general welfare of man and the quality of his environment as they are today. . . . The long popular view of universities as cloistered enclaves of study, meditation, and reflection is gradually being replaced by one which more accurately reflects their contemporary role as centers of action for the solution of many of society's pressing and emerging problems." He continued at some length, with much talk of "dynamics," "opening windows," "changes in society," "challenges," "reality," "contemporary life," and so on and on, but I need not quote him further. You know that speech; you have often given it yourselves.

---

[3] McGeorge Bundy, "A Report from an Academic Utopia," Harper's Magazine, CCXXIV, No. 1340 (January, 1962), p. 15.

No acuteness is required to perceive that much of this high-flown eloquence is born of uncertainty. One president incapable of uttering a cliché, Charles Odegaard of the University of Washington, has confronted this uncertainty directly. He compares our present era to the long period in which American colleges learned how to be universities. "The need and the opportunity," he points out,

> were recognized by faculties years before the institutionalized forms and routine patterns of funding could be established. So it seems that we must struggle through a period when the need and the opportunity for still another instructional effort are evident to imaginative faculty, but when a comfortable framework of organization and financing has not yet been forged. . . . It seems to be the lot of the University to identify new services which it can, and which it believes it should, render to society, only to find itself in a chronic state of overextension. However, it may be just this quality of dedication and adaptability to meet newly perceived needs with appropriate services which have helped to keep universities not merely alive but among our oldest surviving corporate institutions.[4]

More than a few of the leaders of extension who consolidated the gains of the past fifteen years have found ways to use their talents to guide and direct the growth of the new, larger framework of university programming. They are deeply engaged in the struggle envisioned by President Odegaard and have accepted the heavy burdens of responsibility which it imposes.

---

[4] Charles E. Odegaard, "Trends in Continuing Education," Spectrum: University of Washington, Continuing Education, IV, No. 2 (December, 1966), p. 24.

267

Many of the other leaders of extension, however, have suddenly and unexpectedly found themselves confronting a new and perplexing problem. They are the prisoners of their own success. In the struggle to get programs established, they have created fixed images of themselves and structures, routines, and orthodoxies in their programs. Now both the leaders and the programs are accepted—but pigeonholed. The new language of university presidents, leaders of professions, faculty innovators, foundation executives, government officials, and legislators reflects an uncertain groping for goals beyond the scope of most present programs. Just as we were beginning to hope that higher adult education might finally be coordinated, we suddenly discover, all across the campus, new extension divisions, each with a special purpose and each going its separate way. Generalized distrust is widespread. The President of the United States has made it clear that he thinks very highly of extension; yet in proposing Title I of the Higher Education Act, he said, "The role of the university must extend far beyond the ordinary extension-type operation."[5] Other comments are even less friendly; they almost suggest (to quote that great philosopher, Pogo) that "we have met the enemy and they are us."[6]

Some of us may content ourselves with the achievement of established purposes and programs, even though such a decision means that their influence will become proportionately smaller in the full range of the university's services. Those who wish to accept the challenge of the new, however, are not likely to be long deterred from doing so. For when one looks below the surface, it is soon evident that the new services must use the same principles which underlie our successful present programs. The language is different and impatient newcomers may brush our experience aside, but they will discover they cannot escape the problems we have learned how to analyze and solve.

Our theme today, like that of fourteen years ago, deals with the purposes of continuing higher education; we concentrate on ends and not on means, however important the latter may be. I propose, then, to look at the principles which guide the selection of our present objectives and show how we may use those same principles to define the purposes of our new endeavors. My motto is the advice once given by the aged Mark Twain to the young Winston Churchill: "To be good is noble; to teach others how to be good is nobler, and no trouble."[7]

---

[5] U. S. Congressional Record, 89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965, CXI, Part 1, p. 600.

[6] For this quotation I am indebted to Dr. George Miller whose exhaustive literary studies are insufficiently appreciated.

V

When Professor "Knee" Anderthal walks for the first time into his introductory psychology class in the evening college, he enters a situation in which objectives are fairly clear-cut, perfected (by himself and others) over long years of experimentation and trial and error. His textbook is based on 2,500 years of speculation and a century of research. The results of all this effort have been laboriously worked out in content and form by an author who has tested every concept in his own classes and who faces the hotly competitive market in introductory psychology texts. The instructional setting is a standard one—discussion of the text and of supplementary materials, lectures by Professor Anderthal, films and demonstrations, quizzes, a term paper, and a final written examination. The values are oriented toward the acquisition of knowledge and its application. Anderthal may stress the fact that the students should master concepts, while his colleague Magnon may stress the incorporation of psychological principles into the lives of his students. But these will be relative emphases; any professor will value both knowledge and practice. The social setting and the individuals served will be fairly standard for evening colleges: a city large enough to support a degree program and a group of ambitious students who are relatively homogeneous in background and outlook. Even though the objectives are clear and well defined, they are not static. No group of students is like any other. Anderthal must accommodate himself to this fact as well as to the changes in himself since he last taught this course and those which occur while he teaches it.

The real objectives which guide this particular teaching-learning activity have been determined by five factors: a body of content or subject-matter; a set of values; a social milieu; a group of learners; and a format in which the range of means available is limited. These elements have coalesced into a changing and evolving pattern of purposes determined collectively not merely by Anderthal and his students and the dean, but also by the inherited wisdom which has created the discipline, established the city, and organized the evening college.

---

[7] Randolph S. Churchill, Winston S. Churchill, Vol. I: Youth, 1874-1900 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966), p. 525.

These same five factors create the objectives of every program of education. The quality of the learning provided depends upon how well the separate elements are understood and how effectively they are combined. We take them so much for granted in tried-and-tested older programs, where quality has evolved as a result of long collaborative effort, that we sometimes believe that the excellence of one program establishes its substance rather than its inherent principles as the *sine qua non* of all later programs. Thus some people hold rigorously to the content-oriented classroom with the transmission of knowledge as the sole value, holding that any other conception of higher learning must be invalid. When a new educational need emerges, however, it usually cannot be cramped into a crystallized framework built to serve older needs. Instead, the designers of the new activity must use their best judgment to think about its values, content, social setting, learners, and format, and their effective combination. If not, the future will be guided by the rigidity, not the creativity, of the past.

None of the five factors can be chosen as paramount, though many people champion the cause of some one of them, arguing perhaps that content or value or the needs of particular learners must be the chief or the sole determinants of objectives. But as Henri Bergson once remarked, specialization is a form of intellectual laziness. The planner usually starts with one factor as an initiating cause, but the real objectives are not finally perfected until all five factors have been dealt with, either deliberately or unconsciously. Illustration is perhaps the best way to demonstrate this point; let us therefore examine a case study.

A staff member of an urban university extension center pondered the fact, not long ago, that the confrontation between democracy and communism which has long dominated political thought and action seemed less acute than it had before, partly as a result of the rise of new ideologies. A reordering of the spectrum of social philosophies, he decided, was needed if people were to make sense of the current world. One way to have such a reordering would be to study them comparatively. The faculty of the university could be called upon for intellectual leadership, but true learning requires that there be more than a few lectures and discussions. The staff member formulated a plan for three residential weekend seminars. The first explored varieties of communism, including classical Marxism, bolshevism, and national communism. The second dealt with varieties of democracy—American democracy, western European democracy, and aberrations in democracy. The third was devoted to the varieties of nationalism—American, western European, and eastern European. In selecting the thoughtful citizens required for such a program, the university tried to draw people from various segments of the city's life, so that the program would have a continuing impact in many places.

In this case, just as in Professor Anderthal's class, the beginning point was content—specifically, here, an understanding of the new ideologies which control and govern man's life today. This content was available in the disciplined thought and capacities of university faculty members who could express it by what the Danes call "the living word." The governing value was that this body of knowledge was worth understanding by the active citizen. The desired learners were able and thoughtful opinion leaders; if they did not exist in sufficient quantity, the program could not be held. The university is in a city, and thus extension leaders could examine a distinctive social setting to locate those individuals who were most thoughtful and influential. Social setting has another meaning here as well; the residential location made possible the creation of a totally educative milieu. Finally, the format was the series of three weekend seminars; this format had its distinctive strengths and limitations different from those imposed, say, by a ten-lecture series at a downtown auditorium or by a correspondence course. The five factors involved blend together, none of them sharply different from the others and all of them essential.

Perhaps you might like to try your hand at the analysis of a few more cases, identifying both the starting point and the way by which the other factors become involved. In a western city, a new social problem was created by the large-scale immigration of Mexican-Americans. The staff of the local extension center therefore designed an eight-session lecture series (plus four implication sessions for those who wanted credit) to explore such subjects as the manipulation of minorities by self-interest groups, guidance counselors' views of Mexican-American children, conflicts in value systems, minority group patterns, and new job training opportunities. The effort throughout was to achieve understanding, an enlarged conception of how the community might be improved by a greater involvement of the new citizens, and a clear-cut change in community conditions. The target audience for the course was composed of influential lay and professional leaders who could effect that change: people from schools, foundations, government, social agencies, and the university itself. Professors and specialists from community agencies presented the lectures and led the implication sessions.

At a university in a highly industrialized state, the director of extension developed the concept of mid-career training for adults who had already assumed leadership positions. Believing that a paramount problem in his state was the establishment of social control over the violently anti-social forces of ungoverned urban growth, he identified a group of professionals from planning boards, elected and appointed officials from municipal and state government, personnel managers from business, and representatives of the clergy, unions, and voluntary organizations. A ten-session seminar then explored the roots of modern urban problems, raised relevant issues of public policy, searched for solutions, and attempted to stimulate creative thinking in dealing with the process of community change. Discussions focused on such subjects as the causes, conditions, and consequences of urbanism in modern society, the impact of urbanism on the natural environment, and what the arts can do to help us understand urban problems. The leadership was drawn chiefly from the university faculty, but, in an effort to combine theory with reality, one third of the seminar sessions were led by people actually engaged in urban development and community change in the state.

Some of the staff members at a midwestern urban extension center believed that jazz should be much better known and appreciated than it is. Consequently they involved not only the music department of the university but also the local jazz society and the staff of a conference facility in planning a two-day conference in which talk about jazz accompanied the making of jazz music. Based on the theme "Contrasts in Jazz," the program attempted to show the variety of contrasts in music, contrasts in opinion, and contrasts among those engaged in the jazz art and jazz life. More than fifty lecturers and musicians discussed and demonstrated the complete range of jazz activities. Demonstration groups compared jazz to classical music, showed the relevance of African music, and demonstrated historic types of improvisation. More than two hundred people attended the conference. Many were new listeners to jazz and therefore part of the target audience, but many others were musicians, scholars, and teachers and students of jazz and other music.

One university in a relatively sparsely populated state has an excellent residential center. The staff of this center developed the idea of weekend seminar-conferences designed to give adults additional insights into their own problems and the problems of our times. Each weekend, the conference focused on a particular problem or theme; participants could enroll for one weekend or more. Among topics covered were listening, communication, productive thinking, the mind, world problems, health, censorship, and religion. Three weekends were devoted to an examination of "cultural lag." Though each conference was unique, the staff tried to link them together, thereby providing a sense of continuity to the student. The staff members were drawn from the university faculty and elsewhere. The students were the otherwise isolated intellectuals of the state who found in the university a sense of community.

These five illustrations may seem familiar. They were drawn from the November issue of the newsletter of CSLEA, in which some American universities identified their outstanding programs of 1965-66.[8] Wherever possible the actual language of the report was used. Where facts were not given, I supplied them, hoping my imagination would not seem too fanciful. The same five component elements have been combined in each case, creatively and distinctively, to bring about a new program, vastly different in surface ways from that of Professor Anderthal's classroom but, at a deep level, essentially similar to it.

To combine these elements successfully in individual, practical cases, each must be understood in depth. Content is never fixed and rigid; the planner selects the precise elements required in a particular case. To know but a few methods of learning is to have little freedom of choice. The same fact is true of values, individual learners, and social setting. Each must be put into the larger contexts of philosophy, psychology, and the social sciences. This is why we listen attentively to Professor Kallen and other philosopher-psychologists and to President Blackwell and other social scientists. Neither the psychologist nor the sociologist can provide the single guide for all our work—but each can illuminate an essential sector of it.

---

[8] Continuing Education for Adults, No. 101-102 (November 7, 1966).

The refinement of purposes is but one task of the program planner, though a crucial one. He needs other kinds of knowledge and competence as well, among them a firm conception of the nature of maturity and the learning which occurs during it, an awareness of the history and scope of adult education, administrative skill, and a grasp of educational technology. The extension leader of today is a stranger to none of these arts and bodies of knowledge. They have been rewarding to him in the past, they are now, and they can be in the future.

VI

It is often argued, by both precept and practice, that new programs should be the concern only of those who teach them. The leaders of higher adult education are essentially administrators who spend most of their time either organizing and arranging instruction or supervising the work of those who do. As in every other institution, the more important the academic administrator is in the hierarchy, the less he is able to share in the basic work itself.

A professor at Duke has recently suggested that apes are as useful subjects for study as any humans he might hope to find around a university. Lemurs, he says, are like students; they are bright-eyed, bushy-tailed, and can't believe the world is the way it is. Baboons are like faculty members; they are intelligent, sociable, clever, untidy, and you can't trust them. The professor might have added that gorillas are like academic administrators: their appetite is enormous; they show little originality, initiative, or insight; they rise from a crouching position only to threaten intruders; and the typical wound they inflict on others is a bite in the rear.[9]

But when any administrator loses his sense of purpose and his personal and direct stake in planning for the future, he becomes nothing more than a bureaucrat. Presidents and governors have legislative programs, generals plan battles and campaigns, and industrial leaders organize production and distribution with a keen sense of new opportunities in the market. In times of change or great opportunity—as is the case today in higher adult education—it is particularly necessary for the administrator, no matter how exalted, to return to the fundamental program-building nature of his basic service and work creatively at the forefront of the challenge presented to him.

---

[9] For other fascinating facts on gorillas, see Encyclopedia International, VIII, 89-90.

Let me be specific. Every vice-president, dean, director, or major staff member involved in higher adult education has most of his time and thought committed to the repetitive necessities of his work. If five hundred courses and programs were offered last year, then four hundred of them will be given again this year and perhaps another fifty will represent simple extensions of the previous offering—Spanish 201, for example, in addition to Spanish 101. These four hundred and fifty courses and programs take a great deal of executive work—laying the foundations in the university and the community, recruiting and inducting the teaching staff, admitting and counseling the students, maintaining the physical facilities, promoting the work, handling the subtle processes which support the institution itself as well as its specific activities, overplanning to make sure that emergencies do not occur, and being resourceful when they do. The administrator can allow all of his time to be swallowed up in the processes of maintenance or, if he has any free time, he can devote it to the perfection of his administrative mechanisms.

You know what will happen if he does. The fifty missing courses and programs needed to match last year's score will not be provided or will be supplied by standard items from the university's curriculum. Next year will be the same as this year. The administrative machine works smoothly and effectively and things go on as before. For a while. Then, despite every executive effort, things go sour. Faculty discontent and withdrawal, a hardening of the hearts of central administrators, a lowering of the caliber of the student body, a greater difficulty in finding effective staff members, a marked growth of competing institutions; these and other ills are experienced by a higher adult educational unit which is preoccupied with maintaining itself and which, as a result, draws farther and farther away from the fresh and upward-thrusting interests and concerns of the university, its community, and the larger society.

The consequences of an exclusive preoccupation with administration are equally disastrous for the administrator himself. One great problem in the highly skilled occupations is that their practitioners grow bored with their work—and this fact is particularly true of those who administer. The doctor gets tired of thumping chests, the dentist of peering into mouths, the professor of meeting classes, and the lawyer of reading briefs; but all these men at least have a personal relationship with their clients. The administrator is denied this satisfaction. He is once or twice or many times removed from the direct service which his institution provides. Where else can he gain satisfaction? The delights of mobility, freedom, flexibility, and influence are delicious at first, but presently they pall. His authority is great, but he learns its limits. His higher income gives him a good standard of living, but he gets used to it and finds that he is living on a plateau, unable to detect any sudden and dramatic increases in that standard; nor is he any longer sure that he really wants them. He begins to believe more and more in the old adage that if you want to know what God thinks of money, look at the people to whom he gives it.

There are at least three classic solutions for this boredom, other than simply enduring it. One is to make a sharp break with one's craft or profession. As every counselor of adults knows, a surprising number of people solve their problems in precisely this fashion. A second solution is to find new life and zest outside one's occupation—in what Professor Kallen fourteen years ago called one's night-life. Who can deny that, for most people, such a solution is essential, particularly since duty-driven deans have often given the early years of their maturity to their work-life. The third solution is to find a new meaning in the occupation itself. For the administrator, this course of action almost invariably means a return to the basic work of the institution rather than a restudy of executive procedures.

The first and second alternatives lie beyond our discussion today, but the third is surely relevant. No institution can prosper and no administrator can remain intellectually alive in his work unless he insists upon a realm of discretion for himself. Perhaps he must expect that 90 per cent of his time must pass beyond his control; it is dangerously easy for the rest of it to follow. However unselfish he may seem to himself for thus devoting every moment to the needs of others, experienced observers are likely to conclude that his failure to safeguard his time to think and plan means either that he is afraid of thought or that he does not understand the deeper requirements of the life of administration. The discretionary realm, in which the executive devotes his time to the forward thrust of the program, is the most important part of his job both for himself and for his institution.

VII

If there is a single key to success, it may lie in considering the role of the administrator of higher adult education in a professional way. Let us avoid tedious arguments about whether the administration of higher adult education is, will be, or should be a profession. Let us merely ask what the professional does and what he knows and then see whether we should fashion our practice according to his model.

What the professional does is to face each new practical case with the awareness that it is unique. Every patient, every lawsuit, every engineering project, every building, and every religious convocation must be viewed as a separate and distinctive whole. The extension administrator who adopts this attitude looks at the future as a series of challenges. He does not merely protect his procedures or fit new possibilities of service into the rigidities of old practice. Each new opportunity for service presents a problem different from any he has ever encountered before.

What the professional knows is drawn from several bodies of subject matter, never just one. Medicine rests upon many disciplines, including anatomy, physiology, pathology, and biochemistry. Law depends upon political science, economics, ethics, and history. Adult education, like medicine and law, is an art based upon many sciences. President Blackwell and Professor Kallen will deal with but two of them.

Whitehead defined a craft as a vocation "based upon customary activities and modified by the trial and error of individual practice."[10] Our long experience, particularly that of the last fifteen years, has taught us to be excellent craftsmen. But a profession, he says, is a vocation "whose activities are subject to theoretical analysis and are modified by theoretical conclusions derived from that analysis."[11] In most occupational fields, society allows only the professional to undertake the major and most difficult responsibilities. Craftsmen it permits to do the useful and necessary but humbler tasks. The work of the administrator of higher adult education has already moved a long way from a craft toward a profession, but it must move much farther before we can collectively confront the responsibilities immediately before us.

---

[10] Alfred North Whitehead, Adventures of Ideas (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933), p. 73.

[11] Ibid., p. 72.

Perhaps this is the path to be followed if we are to move beyond the confused year of fifteen to the halcyon days of sixteen which, Gesell assures us, lie just ahead.

COMMUNITY NEEDS AND HIGHER CONTINUING EDUCATION

Gordon W. Blackwell

I

Professor Cyril Houle, speaking about the paper which I gave fourteen years ago, said then that it was "a practical tool which will bring [evening college deans] great rewards if they wish to learn how to use it." I have no way of knowing how many paid any attention to what I said or whether anyone found it at all rewarding.

In any event my purpose was to suggest a kind of sociological framework for community understanding. As an oversimplification I suggested seven dimensions of the community, each related to the others but also susceptible to separate analysis: (1) population, including age and sex distribution, racial and nationality composition, educational level, geographical mobility; (2) institutional structure, including the various social institutions, agencies, and organized groups developed to meet human needs; (3) value systems, the ideas men live by and will fight for; (4) social stratification, including social class and caste structures and social mobility; (5) patterns of informal social relationships, including factors of leadership and influence; (6) power structure, involving patterned relationships between individuals who are able to move goods and services in the community; and (7) ecology, including the geographical and socio-economic organization of the community into various functional areas involving patterns of transportation.

Now, with the advantage of time passage and the experience of having been in the administration of higher education rather than in academic sociology for the last ten years, I should like to attempt to do two additional things: first, take a quick look at the American scene in ferment and note highlights in changing urban community needs; and second, raise questions as to how urban universities and continuing higher education may help to meet these needs.

Change is perhaps the most widely accepted phenomenon in American society. One need only listen to a commencement address at any level or pick up a serious article in almost any periodical. The fact of change is featured. In the words of Kenneth Haygood of CSLEA, we are being "thrust into the vortex of a rapidly changing and increasingly complex social system." And in all of this concern for social change, it is generally agreed that the most dramatic and far-reaching change has been rapid urbanization. What a few decades ago was an essentially rural society now has become predominantly urban, with 70 per cent of the population living in cities. Even the 30 per cent who are still classified as rural are essentially urban in outlook, attitudes, and living patterns. A concomitant of urbanization has been the herding together of urban people into great metropolitan complexes.

This new way of life is faster, more dynamic, less isolated, more creative, more innovative, more superficial, more anonymous, more transient, and characterized by higher mobility, both geographical and social, than was the former, rural society. These social and psychological changes are fundamental to the individual as well as basic in the nature of society.

And what makes all this more important is the fact that this rapid change has brought complex, serious, and sometimes apparently insoluble problems. In the words of Paul Ylvisaker, "Like crabs, we are walking backwards into our urban future and begrudging every step along the way." Most Americans are or soon will be living in vast metropolitan areas with increasingly serious community problems. In this situation it is difficult to protect the human dimension.

For example, amassing of large agglomerations of urban people has led to new transportation needs threatening our cities with stagnation and deterioration. Sufficient housing of adequate quality has not been supplied, and there are perhaps more slum dwellers than ever before in spite of public housing projects. Air pollution threatens to weaken the vitality of our city dwellers and choke off our metropolitan civilization.

But all of the problems spawned by urbanization are not physical. Rapid changes in stratification and value systems are being demanded, and the voices will not be stilled. The civil rights movement of the past decade comes about as close to social revolution as this country has witnessed. One need mention only Watts or Harlem. Furthermore, problems of crime and delinquency are particularly acute in our great cities.

The role of government has been considerably enlarged, and this has been one of the major changes in our value systems. Legal controls, backed by the force of federal financial resources and undreamed of two decades ago, are today everywhere around us. Here again has been another fundamental change in a basic value system which has been accepted more readily in cities than in smaller communities.

Thus, although there has been no period of major economic depression during the past fifteen years, we have seen the development of extremely serious community problems, and most of these are concentrated in our very large urban areas. It remains now to consider how urban universities and continuing higher education can help to meet these community needs.

II

Many educators, of course, would say that to make direct attack upon community problems would be going beyond the commonly prescribed purposes of adult education. At our 1953 workshop Professor Houle pointed out that some believe that the evening college must educate for action, while others hold that those in continuing higher education must improve the community only indirectly by improving the individuals in it. Recently Professor Houle suggested three broad goals of higher education which he believes are related to adult education. One of these he listed as "the desire to improve directly the conditions of life of a man and his society."[1] This purpose, of course, for a century has been a primary goal of land-grant institutions with their most significant programs of higher continuing education. The question is now squarely before the urban universities as to whether they can perform somewhat the same role for their immediate environs.

Perhaps rivaling the emergence of land-grant universities in both dramatic impact and significance for society has been the development of a number of urban universities, institutions not merely situated in cities but more and more becoming an essential part of the warp and woof of metropolitan life. One thinks of the Circle campus of the University of Illinois at Chicago or the Cleveland State University with its proposed new $213,000,000 campus on a 144-acre site as illustrative of new institutions taking their places alongside the many long-existing urban universities. My own Furman University has a record of direct service to the community dating back to the 1930's, when the college created the Greenville County Council for Community Development.

---

[1] Cyril O. Houle, "The Roles of Continuing Education in a Changing Nation," speech given at conference on Higher Education in the South, Gatlinburg, Tennessee, February 22-24, 1961.

Speaking at a Yeshiva University dinner in New York recently, Senator Abraham Ribicoff declared that urban universities were showing "the same concern and commitment for city problems that the land-grant college of an earlier generation showed for rural problems. . . . Our cities have always housed universities," he said. "That is nothing new, but more often than not, the university in the city has more in common with the international community of scholars than it did with the community in which it was located. . . . Often the city and university were natural enemies instead of natural allies." But all this has changed, Senator Ribicoff indicated, "and the need for knowledge and wisdom is overwhelming."

Nine days earlier the senator's subcommittee heard James M. Hester, President of New York University, testify that the need for urban revolution was so great that it required congressional action to transform urban universities into "fully developed university centers."

His point was underscored at the founding convocation of the University of Massachusetts' Boston branch. Describing the goals of the institution, Chancellor John W. Ryan said the new campus would be "urban in character, urban in commitment, urban in student body origins and destinies, urban in faculty research interests, [and] urban in the flavor of its institutional culture and values and outlook."

In Washington meanwhile at an Urban Affairs Conference, Secretary Robert C. Weaver of the Department of Housing and Urban Development urged the nation's universities to "train a whole new order of urban expert." And on various campuses there were indications that the universities, at least, were trying to do more.

Trustees of the University of Illinois approved the establishment of a Center for Urban Studies as a division of the University's Chicago Circle campus. Indiana University announced that next semester it would focus as much as possible of its academic resources on "the city"; the university plans to bring a series of speakers to the campus, offer interdepartmental seminars and special institutes, and generally emphasize urban affairs in a number of courses. Trustees of Massachusetts' eleven state colleges, ten of which have teacher education programs, announced they were seeking a one-million-dollar federal grant to prepare teachers for positions in urban schools.

But let us look further at what some of these American leaders are saying along these lines. First, Senator Ribicoff:

> When we begin to formulate a policy for urban universities, let us first state our conviction that the university should offer a program of study that is relevant to the world outside and will attract the most committed—as well as the most intellectual—young people of our nation. . . . For many years Einstein . . . has been our academic model. We need Einsteins. But we also need our Edisons—the men of action who can apply their knowledge to the immediate task at hand.

Ribicoff believes that urban universities should do these things: offer degree programs in urban studies, areas in which we will need an increasingly large number of trained personnel in the years ahead; study the whole problem of who will organize our cities and their services; develop urban extension programs to meet the urgent and pressing needs of a neighborhood. As he puts it:

> One of the great tragedies of our cities is that we tend to write off a whole generation of adults—those who live in the slums and gray areas—as a lost generation. We have programs for their children, but little beyond the basic literacy courses for the parents. A university extension system would be invaluable in helping our migrants from rural America learn how to live in urban America.

The senator suggests further that the university offer refresher, inservice training programs to public officials who want to improve their skills and learn new techniques of administration as well as new theories and discoveries about human behavior; conduct research into major issues of the day, issues such as crime and violence, air and water pollution, transportation; and develop the applications of systems analysis used so successfully in our space program (we must understand, however, that a social system in a large-scale human environment is much more complex than a space capsule environment and a missile system). An especially important area would be the development of service delivery systems so the people could be served faster and more efficiently by their government and by the many private resources which today have such strong interests in making democracy work. Finally, the senator suggests that our urban universities pool their research efforts and establish action centers in all our major metropolitan areas. He adds: "A major shortcoming in our urban policy is a lack of real knowledge about urbanization. Our study of man in the urban environment is very new."

Secretary Robert C. Weaver has pointed up the need for new kinds of education to produce those people who must help meet urban problems:

> The university must become more and more the crucible for new ideas in meeting the urban challenges. This implies a new order of research activity which must encompass many disciplines. . . . As we have slowly come to realize, the immense problems of this new metropolitan age simply do not respond to simplistic and piecemeal solutions. It follows that the research programs we need must be structured to consider the subtleties and complexities of the problem.
>
> The next order of business for the universities is to train a whole new order of urban experts. This country is starving for good planners and good public administrators and good social psychologists. . . . We need to train a new kind of urban generalist, the man who can administer the kinds of new programs—such as Model Cities—which are going to make their appearance in the next few years. And it is the universities which must bear most of the burden in producing a new kind of Renaissance Man.

President James M. Hester of New York University suggests a positive approach based on the reinvigorating of those forces that have brought durability and distinction to the great cities of the world and have made them attractive to people of intelligence and enterprise. These historic forces include commerce, communication, education, and culture.

It can be argued that education is a central force, the one that undergirds and strengthens all the others. Hester believes a new approach to education in the city is essential if we are to have a true renaissance of urban life:

> Urban universities have been used largely to provide inexpensive, accessible instruction to city dwellers of limited means. This is a useful function but does not make the urban universities strong enough or attractive enough to do the major tasks requires. . . . Today the nation's most pressing need . . . is an urban revolution. I believe such a dramatic development can be based on effective use of our educational resources.

Chancellor John W. Ryan has called for an Urban Grant University Act which would make possible a creative partnership in the major programs developed to improve our urban society. Such legislation would provide:

> A creative partnership between federal, state, and local jurisdictions to obviate inequities of service burdens and costs, and to gain a multiplier effect in benefits received from university participation and program planning, operation, and evaluation.
>
> A creative partnership between the academic institutions, public and private, which now exist as urban universities, and which already have plunged into the effort to deal with urban problems.
>
> A creative partnership between the intellectual community of all urban institutions and the professional community of administrative officials and public servants charged with active responsibility in the campaign for improved urban positions of life and work.

This Urban Grant University Act would set up the urban university "as a new vista in the several programs having specific goals and responsibilities in such areas as housing, health, recreation, economic opportunity, educational opportunity and others."

III

Now it seems to me that a goodly number of these urban universities will indeed develop along the lines suggested and will undertake to have a vital impact on the human problems created by mass agglomerations of people. There seems little doubt also but that sizable federal funds will be available for these efforts. Those in higher continuing education, then, must determine what their role will be within this new conception of the university for urban service.

Certainly rapid change requires that the people be prepared to respond to changing conditions. The nature of these conditions and problems must be understood by as high a proportion of the people as possible. Alternative solutions should be formulated and communicated to the people for their judgmental decisions.

In addition to communication with the various mass publics, attention must be focused on two other groups: (1) the policy-forming and administrative groups, and (2) in David Truman's words, "the intervening elites." William J. Cook has made the point that continuing education will achieve most by focusing on this latter group if the objective is to effect social change.[2]

---

[2] William J. Cook, "Education Toward Changing Social Environment," Adult Education, XII (Autumn, 1961), pp. 28-32.

The pioneering work by Howard Y. McClusky and his associates in Michigan in helping small town and rural leaders discover viable solutions to their community problems may perhaps be undertaken in the city by the urban university.[3]

Kenneth Haygood has suggested that adult education divisions can serve as "advanced scouts" in exploring what the commitments of the urban university should be in response to increasingly aggravated community problems. This means that we must become problem-oriented rather than discipline-oriented; it also means that integrated, interdisciplinary approaches will be required.

Several years ago A. A. Liveright[4] touched upon this problem in quoting Sir Geoffrey Vickers in The Undirected Society: "Often the violence of these periodic changes is due to their belatedness; and this in turn may result from the incoherence of the society concerned, which has been unable to mobilize the attention, the energy or the agreement needed for action until some condition has become so acute as to threaten imminent destruction." Liveright suggested that here Vickers has proposed the unique and important role of a university in the area of continuing and community education. Liveright believes that "the university has the responsibility for examining the process and for educating adults about how changes occur, about the consequences of various possible changes and about the values involved in these consequences." If the urban university is to help guide social change, it must revise curricula, provide continuing educational opportunities for alumni, be concerned with urban problems, i.e., relate extension to research, and it must deal in citizenship education.

IV

And so you have the alternatives as I see them in 1967: restrict our higher continuing educational activities to the individual in an effort to make him better educated and more mature culturally, or add to this traditional objective an additional focus upon the desired end of social action in the amelioration of community problems. Several years ago

---

[3] Howard Y. McClusky, "A Study of Community Leaders' Perceptions," Adult Education, XV (Summer, 1965), pp. 246-52.

[4] A. A. Liveright, "The Role of the University in an Undirected Society," Adult Education, XII (Autumn, 1961), pp. 33-41.

Renee and William Peterson of Canada gave their answer in the volume, University Adult Education. In no uncertain terms they took the position that university efforts in community improvement are "non-education." They put it this way, "Adult educators in community development have gone into an already-staffed field, to which they contribute nothing that is new and little that is useful."[5]

I take the opposite view. I believe the university should not be merely a mirror of its society but should definitely and actively affect social change. Perhaps in a dictatorship this would not be so necessary. Perhaps a few highly trained experts could be relied upon to make decisions and to carry them out. However, democracy fortunately does not work this way. We must have a level of understanding among the masses of our people so that they can make intelligent decisions at the polls and so that many can participate effectively in local voluntary efforts for community betterment. We must have urban specialists of many new types, and these must be trained in the universities. Continuing higher education must accept the responsibility of updating the training of these personnel and keeping them abreast of recent developments. We must have a closer coordination between the research of the universities and their graduate, professional, and continuing educational programs. And finally, higher continuing education must serve to motivate and inform the intervening elites, those who play such an important role in social action in a democracy.

The stupendous problems facing our cities pose a direct challenge to higher education. I believe this challenge is before higher continuing education no less than the other segments of the urban university. Adult educators must respond vigorously and quickly to these new community needs with imaginative, innovative approaches and programs.

---

[5] Quoted in Liveright, ibid.

THE ADULT INDIVIDUAL, HIGHER EDUCATION, AND THE FUTURE

Horace M. Kallen

I

As in war the battle is the payoff, so in education the lesson is the payoff. All the rest—the logistics, the strategy, and the tactics, which compound into a design of education and a school system—are at best preliminaries to the confrontation of teacher and learner in a classroom, be the classroom Mark Hopkins' log, a corner soapbox with a crowd around, a scientist's laboratory, or a living room hospitably opened to a gathering of living room learners. The worth and meaning of the hierarchical establishment turn on the unknown future for which the confrontation is believed to contribute direction and form; the unknown is symbolized in the image being brought to life by the hopes and fears of the learner's need and the knowledge and skill of the teacher's art. Its use is to render the learner's future different from his past, to change his past, either as the teacher intends it or as the learner wants it.

In the colleges and universities the intention of the teacher is supposed to overrule the wanting of the non-adult; but when the learners are qualified as "adult," their wants are supposed to hold precedence over the teacher's intentions. An adult learner's commitments are acknowledged to be, first, to his own business and desires. The fields of his study are his own choice, and he is no captive of his choice. He comes and stays away as he pleases. The learning of his lesson is his triumph, not the teacher's. The justification of his successful effort is seen as his eagerness to keep on learning, his hunger for more. Its measure becomes his ongoing endeavor to continue learning, to gain more. This gets taken for the sanction of the educational enterprise which enables him to secure and maintain this satisfaction.

That is, for him, the learner; but not necessarily for the teacher, nor for the institution whose front-soldier the teacher is, The teacher and his organization may be led by quite another image of the future for the learner to make real, an image perhaps in no way commeasurable with the learner's own design for his future self. This seems not often the case when the field of study is a vocation with its doctrine and discipline, its specifics of theory and practice, and its mystery. It is the case frequently when the field is some variety of what is called culture, the humanities, and when the education of the adult is signalized as "liberal."

By and large, designs of "liberal education for adults" give prior consideration to the theory and practice of teaching rather than to the processes of learning in those chosen fields; and the teaching is conceived as instituting in the learner certain awarenesses, certain ongoing attitudes toward what is taught and certain lasting ways of perceiving and appraising it. The conception requires that the liberal education of adults should become, in all its diverse endeavors, something more or less like the priestly vocation; that persons who are called to it should feel that their ministry is to help adults to become, in the language of the Ford Fund,[1] "mature, wise and responsible citizens who can participate intelligently in a free society."

How "a free society" lives and moves and has its being, in what form, with what functions, and whether its intelligently participating citizens be themselves free or bond (for bondsmen have been known to participate intelligently in societies called free), is left unsaid. A learner would have to surmise what might be the relationships between his individual self, his free society, and the education which is to prepare him for or sustain him in his present and prospective role in his society. He would have to surmise who decides on the what, the how, and the why of this syndrome which he is to learn and the media with which it is to be taught. Regarding ends and means, ultimate and proximate alike, there seems to be a mood of uncertainty and insecurity. Voices have so long been so diverse and discordant that the age has been called the age of anxiety. At various times since the Great Depression, in various forms, the federal government as well as private citizens have attempted to redefine the what, the how, and the why of the syndrome for the American people. The latest redefinition was that produced by President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals. The President had been, before his election, president of a great university; before that, general of America's victorious army. His commission entitled its report, Goals for Americans. It includes a chapter on "National Goals for Education." "Modern life," this chapter declares

---

[1] The Fund for Adult Education of the Ford Foundation.

> has pressed some urgent and sharply defined tasks on education, tasks of producing certain specially needed kinds of educated talent. For the sake of our future, we had better succeed in these tasks—but they can not and should not crowd out the basic goals of our educational system; to foster individual fulfilment and to nurture the free, rational and responsible men and women without whom our kind of society cannot endure. Our schools must prepare all young people for the serious business of being free men and women.

Here again the dominant object of concern is "a kind of society" which so educates its young that they will assure its own survival; and the function of prime concern in the educative process is teaching, not learning. There are implications: first, if you take care of the teaching, the learning will take care of itself; and second, teaching is poorly cared for.

The enterprise of adult education, whether as "continuing" or intermittent, also has these implications.

II

Now, as I read the record of Homo sapiens, his outliving his would-be destroyers of whatever species consists of a continuing struggle to keep on struggling. In this struggle, learning does take care of itself, but the schools, the teachers, the impedimenta, and the diverse hierarchical orders of schooling play a dubious role. Men are born, they mature, they grow old, they die; and from birth to death they learn even as from birth to death they breathe, they feed, they drink and come to breed and fight, each with his own uniqueness, his own singularity of growing up and growing older, always overlapping with his fellows. As the long life story of Homo sapiens goes, he became aware of himself as a learner not so long ago; and rather recently did he come to speculate whether the unexamined life was worth living, and to strain and strive to convert this singularity of his from a natural function into a cultivated art—an art which might either enhance the knowledge and skills wherewith he shaped and sharpened his powers of survival as man or but harness them to the service of his land or his gods. It is with respect to the latter that education gets conceived as a social necessity rather than as a human right of learning, and that teaching is taken for the vital factor in the educative process.

On the record, the learner's exercise of his right to knowledge and the free use thereof was denied to the multitudes of Europe until after the Protestant Reformation. Then it was proclaimed a natural, a sovereign right: a later word for "sovereign" is "unalienable." Hearken to Baruch Spinoza:

> The power of nature has a sovereign right over all things; and inasmuch as the power of nature is the aggregate of all her individual components, it follows that every individual has the sovereign right to do all he can. . . . Now it is the sovereign law and right of nature that each individual should endeavor to preserve itself as it is, without regard to anything but itself; therefore, this sovereign law and right belongs to every individual. . . . Whatsoever an individual does by the laws of its own nature, it has a sovereign right to do: inasmuch as it acts as it was conditioned by nature to act, and cannot do otherwise.[2]

So learning, a survival function no less intrinsic to the "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness" of each and every human being than his other vital functions, and common to them all, is, like them, his sovereign and unalienable right. And this is why the Universal Declaration of Human Rights specified education as one of the thirty rights and freedoms to which, it says, "everyone has the right" whether or not he chooses, or is compelled, to exercise it in schooling. This is why, too, the observation, "living is learning, learning is living," is a truism (except perhaps in relation to schooling), and education figures as a means which is its own end, an end which is its own means. Insofar, however, as education is a cultural institution and a socializing agency, it is a means only, a means to the ends of churches, cities and states, manufacturing, financial and trading corporations, or any other organization of power—including Black Power—which needs or wants to use individuals even to the point of using them up. Alike in freer societies like our own and authoritarian ones like Soviet Russia, it is this schooling of the individual into a tool which more and more makes for tax-supported compulsory school systems designed to carry the generations from elementary through high schools, colleges, universities and higher vocational schools—to carry them with a view to their personal roles as social means.

---

[2] Baruch Spinoza, Theologico-Political Treatise (Tractatus Theologico-Politicus), Ch. 16.

Yet our post-modern, rapid-paced culture, with its new faith and new ways and works, requires of the individual fewer hours of labor at which he earns his living, allows him longer periods of leisure in which he spends what he earns, living his life. Computers and automation liberate him not only as a producer; by increasing and diversifying the goods and services he may exchange his earnings for, they also liberate him as a consumer. Nevertheless schooling concerns predominantly the vocation by which he is to earn his living. The art of how to live for the most part gets left to take care of itself. All around him—in the news, in the slick paper magazines, in the paperbacks and hardbounds, in the libraries and museums—he comes upon images of well-being, of grace, strength, and beauty, of power and reputation. Sometimes he beholds one such "in person." These images solicit him. From these, for the most part, he chooses one to emulate or compounds one to form the Jones he would like to keep up with, to serve as the measure of the good life he would live if he could. His concern as a consumer becomes tangent to his role as a producer; between his personal needs and wishes and the requirements of his job, stresses develop and may become habits, traits of character.

Now the stresses are a function of the learning which is living, and of which schooling may be regarded as a contrived form. The learnings that might satisfy an individual's spontaneous curiosities and the doctrines and disciplines of the schooling tug against each other. The person's formal education, whatever its media, takes him toward ways of life and labor which, as he grows older, fix his life's role in the workaday political and cultural economy. They harden into the gradients of his personal history. They set bounds to his curiosity and interests. They become the containers of his identity. His identity, however, resists its containments. It cuts bypaths toward relief, toward compensation, toward rest and recreation. It seeks to free itself as onlooker or actor by means of sports games of chance, music, stage-plays, literature, and fine arts, by means of hobbies and "do-it-yourself" projects. A current word for this process is "alienation." In the classrooms and in the playgrounds of the schools and colleges, those products of the labors of poets and painters, athletes and actors, composers and virtuosos, even of philosophers, theologians, and scientists are signalized as "the humanities," and teaching them is distinguished as the liberal education befitting free men.

That this is the case off-campus as well need not be argued, I think. The "adult" learner is in stress whether he has failed to complete grade school or boasts an honors degree in the humanities and liberal arts. If, while learning, he cultivates the presently once-more-lauded "excellence," i.e., if he be a specialist, an expert, he is such by dint of this immurement and channeling of his spirit. True, the most excellent of experts can never attain the perfect precision we bestow upon a computer. His actions can never follow from one another with the computer's infallibility. For a learner to become expert is to narrow and confine the range of his knowledge and know-how. It is to restrict his freedom; to cut down the fields, the number and the variety of his choices. Of course, he has not ceased to be free. In the Declaration of Independence, liberty is joined to life and the pursuit of happiness as a right equally unalienable from all humans, however different each may be from the others. As Jefferson put it many years later: "The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time: the hand of force may destroy but cannot disjoin them."

III

First and last, every person's freedom is intrinsic to his individuality, be his social condition serfdom or any other subjection policed by authority and molded into a way of life. It plays a vital part in both the doings and the goals which make up his personal history. Everything he does or refrains from doing is an exercise of this freedom. It is at work in every change he comes to make of his immediate ends and of his means thereto; at work also in the authoritarian containments of it which are designed to channel and determine his choices until his power to make any is believed to have been entirely washed out. (The operation is usually called brainwashing.)

However, every choice, be it compelled or spontaneous, works out as a present suffusion of the past by the future which joins it, and by joining, alters it. This ongoing alteration of the personal past and thereby, sooner or later, of the social past, is survival; it is living on and is indistinguishable from learning, and takes place even when the future comes as a repetition of the past which it joins. Else the repetition would not alter that which it repeats, and the excellence presumed to crown the practice which makes perfect would be un unattainable goal. Indeed, to learn naturally and freely is less to perfect than to diversify and re-pattern the already-learned. Even as the rehearsals which should make perfect narrow and crystallize the learner's vision and streamline his skills, so his learning of the new and different enlarges the scope and depth of his vision and the ranges of his performance and transvalues the meanings of both. The new and different future-becoming-past suffuses and reshapes that which it joins, changing the learner's ways of perceiving and understanding thoughts and things and men and his relations with them.

This is how, it seems to me, knowledge becomes power and education serves as liberation. It is the role rather than the substance of what a learner learns which frees him to exercise the freedom he by nature lives from and by and for. Whatever he has assimilated that both nourishes and releases his vital powers and diversifies the world he uses them in can figure in a program of liberal education—plumbing no less than poetry, garbage-collecting no less than art history or archaeology. As I keep repeating these many years, that is liberal which liberates. And what is there which liberates? What is there which liberates just by being what it is and not by what it does for the ongoing insurance of men's freedoms against their reciprocal containments and aggressions and against non-human barriers, obstructions, and intrusions?

If, as I am convinced, the knowledge and skills of the working day can nourish and enlarge our freedoms no less than the arts and letters and games of the leisured night, vocational education can be rendered as liberating as liberal education is held to be, and liberal education can be shown to be as illiberal as vocational education is held to be. How either works out follows from how the learner informs himself, how the information functions in the reformation of his vision and ways. As is presumed to be the case with the learned professions, the arts and letters, individuals can and do live their lives in and for as well as on any employment which earns them their livings. A plumber or a garbage-collector can begin to transvalue his vocation from servility to freedom, to understand and envision it as an aspect of culture, so soon as he learns to set his day's work in the perspectives of the historic civilization which is his heritage and to place the specific role of his vocation in the formation and transformation of the cities which make the civilization's vital centers. Set in these perspectives, his vocation becomes a consecrated calling like a priest's; with the wage he earns by it comes also a feeling of pride in his commitment to it, a sense of his own personal dignity and worth also because of the service he renders by it to other men. It ceases to be the wall of separation it had become, and is now a bridge to them. The boundary between his day-life and his night-life disappears.

His slavish vocation has been transvalued into a liberal art, and his struggle to go on struggling is alive with a zest and meaning it never felt before.

Call this hint of how adult education might consecrate and ennoble the dirty work of our world "utopian fantasy"; call it "science-fiction"; laugh at it as Mother Sarah laughed when she overheard Jehovah's messengers telling Father Abraham that, past child-bearing as she was, she would bear a son. She did, and she called him Isaac—Yitzchak, in Hebrew—to signalize the joke his birth made of preconceptions of the possible.

IV

It is almost half a century now since the liberal education of the adult has become a consideration of growing importance in the nation's concern about education. The events of the past generation have rendered its theory and practice a vital issue within America's diversified and unordered educational establishment. Under the conditions of the cold war launched after the hottest of all hot wars so far, and of the lesser hot wars which punctuate the cold one, a competitive striving for knowledge has become evident. Not, however, knowledge to render men's lives freer, safer, and more abundant; rather, any and every form of knowledge which should give power over the rival. Of course, the competition takes the form of a struggle for excellence in destruction. The honor in which the traditional liberal education is traditionally held falls away from it. The putative survival values of the sciences and technology take precedence over the putative life values of the humanities and the arts. The pursuit is after knowledge as power. This is the urge in this latest of the industrial revolutions which began some two hundred years ago, and is now a syndrome of global struggles over atomic energy, rocketry, automation, electronic expression and communication, computer control, and cybernetics, their underlying doctrine and discipline.

Now the theory and practice of human relations least incongruous with this new syndrome show themselves to be the hoary authoritarian ones in modern dress. The individual is conceived anew like a thing or tool, to be exchanged for another whenever authority—if unhindered—decides to do so. That which must survive and grow is the organization—the bank, the business, the church, the state, any institution, any establishment—over which the persons of authority rule. The individual signifies only by his place in the organization's structure. Other things being equal, he is expendable. The management of men is designed to function like the manipulation of things. Today's word for the design is "human engineering," and it applies in education no less than in business and the armed forces. The educational enterprise becomes prevailingly an engineering of learners, signalized by gargantuan schools, intelligence and other tests, oversize classes, technical "teaching aids," credit sheets, conduct sheets, and other paper work, bureaucratic hierarchies, with behaviorist postulates of teaching and learning, such as the computers excel in applying, taken for the perfect model of how men think, without regard to why or for what. Education competes with "defense" as the nation's biggest business. During 1966, it involved, in one way or another, between 58 million and 59 million persons, including millions of "adults" classified as such; it cost about 48 billion dollars. Perhaps it would be thankless to speculate how, in terms of the consummation in the classroom, all this relates to the current rebelliousness of young adults, to their "alienation" in our institutions of higher learning, to the diversity of "dropouts" there and in the lower ones, and to the aversion from the entire "culture"—mass, middlebrow, highbrow, and nobrow—of denominations of "beatniks" proclaiming Zen or LSD 25 as the post-modern salvation from the blessings of modernity.

Perhaps, also, there is a challenge in the observation that adults continuing their learning at school are said to do so, for the most part, haphazardly, searching and seeking, not quite knowing why nor for what. Adult education, Francis Keppel writes, "is a necessary revolution in American education." Adult education, the Adult Education Association's Commission of Professors of Adult Education advises us, has become "a new imperative for our time," which the nation's institutions of higher education are obeying by means of one or another academic program of instruction hardly less haphazard than the quest of the learners. Both

Mr. Keppel and the professors speak as though their first concern was what the schools, the colleges, the financial and industrial establishments want to, or should, teach; they indicate only derivatively what and why and wherefore the individual learners might prefer or feel they need to learn from among the teachings offered. They make no reference, as does James Conant writing of The Parent, the Child and the State, to the stress growing between the nation's—I should add any establishment's—needs and the individual common man's growing up and growing older as a free man.

Liberating the individual from such stresses, reshaping their tug and pull into confluence and their divergences into team-play, could be a goal for adult education, though not the only goal. That which the educator, not only of adults, must needs himself learn could be a means, though not the only means, to this end. Ends and means so conjoined could shape up into a configuration in which each individual or group competes for its appropriate excellence in such wise that together they both enhance each other's freedoms and feed into the union of their diversities a power to survive and grow greater than the sum of their parts. As I conceive the relationships of ends and means, of learning and teaching, such a union is the one configuration of them consistent with the American idea and with what has been proclaimed the national purpose and the national goal.

V

The American idea is what Gunnar Myrdal has called, in his American Dilemma, "the American creed." Theodore Parker, who first used the phrase, gave "the idea of freedom" as a synonym. He meant both phrases to denote a conception of what men are, of ends and means in their relations to one another, which the Declaration of Independence takes to be self-evident truth. Other generations have added to this meaning the amendments to the Constitution. Myrdal says of it all, "The American Creed is not merely—as in some other countries—the implicit background of the nation's political and judicial order as it functions. . . . It is the cement in the structure of this great and disparate nation." It is, he adds, a "body of ideals [which are] more widely understood and appreciated than similar ideals anywhere else." Mostly symbolized by phrases and slogans whose meanings are taken for granted, the ideals are brought to consciousness and explicitly invoked in times of great national danger;

297

and they overcome. Lincoln invoked them before the beginning and up to the end of the Civil War; Wilson invoked them during the First World War; Franklin Roosevelt during the Second. I have less in mind Roosevelt's later enumeration of his Four Freedoms than his challenge to the forces sapping and mining at the free union of the diverse which is central to the American idea. "We are," Roosevelt told the people in 1940, "a nation of many nationalities, many races, many religions, bound together by a single unity, the unity of freedom and equality. Whoever seeks to set one nationality against another, seeks to degrade all nationalities; whoever sets one race against another, seeks to enslave all races; whoever sets one religion against another, seeks to destroy all religions." "The Bill of Rights," he reminded his fellow citizens, "was put into the Constitution not only to protect minorities against the intolerance of majorities, but to protect majorities against the enthronement of minorities."

The ultimate, the irreducible minority is, of course, the minority of one, the individual, who can never be enthroned by himself alone, but always can and often does struggle on alone, also unto death, against even the most overwhelming majority.

It is these ultimates, whose choices change majorities into minorities, and minorities into majorities, these individuals with all their diverse singularities of traits and dispositions, of roles and status, whom the American creed unites and cements together, jointly and severally, generation to generation, into the configuration of human life and labor which is the United States of America. The survival and growth of this configuration are rooted in their commitments. The formation it combines, *e pluribus unum*, is the work which either vindicates the faith of the believers or denies it. As the nation's history attests, their lives are struggles for the one or the other, at home and abroad, their perennial goal being their going-on, always and everywhere, as free men. But here, in 1960, comes James P. Dixon, disclosing in his part of the *Report on the National Goals for Americans* that

> We believe that the individual is central to our society, that the principal asset of human society is human life itself, and that society must therefore help protect the lives and interests of every individual. The deep conviction that the individual and his productivity are basic to our free society makes us reluctant to meet human needs in a fashion which might reduce individual initiative and self-reliance.

I submit that I cannot read this confession of faith without misgivings. It is not clear to me that, in the context of this avowal of the "national purpose," the individual does not figure as a means rather than an end. I sense an inversion of the relationship postulated by the American idea between individual and society. The Declaration of Independence takes the individual distributively and considers him primary; ideally, "society" consists, for each, of the other individuals with whom he unites on equal terms for the purpose of instituting "governments" so that all together might secure for each his unalienable rights to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." The post-modern mood, if J. P. Sartre is a reliable oracle, rejects this utterly: "Hell," he tells us, "is other people." Practically, however, "society" comes to mean the institution through which the association functions, the people's organ of service or control; practically, whatever the joint purpose, whatever the goal—national, international, political, religious, scientific, or what have you—society comes to mean government, government society. So President Johnson spoke authentically for the American idea in his special message to Congress of February 28, regarding health and education in the national life. He took for granted what the Declaration had affirmed concerning the relations of "society" and the individuals who maintain it "to secure these rights":

> As a people, we have wanted many things, achieved many things. We have become the richest, the mightiest, the most productive nation in the world.
>
> Yet a nation may accumulate dollars, grow in power, pile stone on stone—and still fall short of greatness. The measure of a people is not how much they achieve—but what they achieve.
>
> Which of our pursuits is mostly worthy of our devotion? If we were required to choose, I believe we would place one item at the top of the list: fulfillment of the individual.
>
> If that is what we seek, mere wealth and power cannot help us. We must also act—in definable and practical ways—to liberate each individual from conditions which stunt his growth, assault his dignity, diminish his spirit. Those enemies we know: ignorance, illness, want, squalor, tyranny, injustice.
>
> To fulfill the individual—this is the purpose of my proposals.

Now although, as Mr. Dixon puts it, "the individual is central" to the national purpose, although he "and his productivity are basic to our free society," he is basic and central in terms of his "initiative and self-reliance" and nothing should be done toward meeting his needs, not to say fulfilling his nature, that might diminish these. Implicit here is an assumption that "society" is something other than an ongoing configuration of diverse ways of living together of diverse individuals, a configuration which has its being as these ways. Is it society, then, the end, and are the individuals whose ways constitute it, and who change it as they change their ways with thoughts, with things, and with one another, means to this end? And are their lives and interests to be protected as means or as ends? Protected by whom, and how, if the society be a free society? What might be their role as individuals of initiative and self-reliance vis-à-vis society's in this protection?

Questions such as these and answers to them might perhaps provide direction and guidance for educators who proffer a liberal education for adults, concerning the aims, the content, and the methods of teaching; might help them to judge what would or would not facilitate learning so that it continues without depending on teaching. Such questions and answers might illuminate inquiry regarding autonomous efforts at self-liberation through schooling like those which in an earlier generation were initiated by self-proletarianizing Kibbutzniks in what is now Israel or self-reliant labor unions and women's clubs in our own world; and of which current instances are the "free universities" voluntarily set up for themselves by students who could not or would not go the runaround of the curricula of the establishments, with their perennial liberal education for everyone and, until now, for every time.

Until now! For, as we shall hear again and again ad nauseam, now is a new time; now all over the globe families of mankind shape and reshape their relations to one another by means of unprecedented instruments of production and destruction and at unprecedented speeds. They confront each other's freedoms with unprecedented insights, designs, and inventions, with gargantuan machines, and with microscopic ones. The sentiment is widespread that all could be used to render everyone's life freer, safer, more abundant, and that they are largely used to menace, command, and enthrall. They pile the human condition high with difficult questions for which neither the knowledge nor the skills of the human tradition provide reliable answers. Add these questions to those which Mr. Dixon's animadversions on the individual raise, and you see the multitudes of him on the loose and at a loss before them, making up, as some sociologists aver, a lonely crowd.

That the condition pertains more to the older individual than the younger is a matter of current observation. For the younger, a reform of education must needs provide the science and the arts that will mobilize his powers and enhance their range and scope without sacrificing their viability. However the biologist conceives his genetic constitution, culturally he has little to unlearn, little for his learning to work over and to free him from. On the other hand the adult is adult by dint of the habits of thought and action, by dint of the "character" he has crystallized into, over the years of his struggle to keep on struggling. The channels of his power have deepened into ruts. The horizon of his vision has become a fixed frame, closing off the beyond. His freedom has been contained, as his children's is not yet, and indeed need never be. Him education must disenthrall, so that he may at least look at the old order with free eyes and solve the same old problems of liberty by different means in different ways.

But when the human prospect looks as it looks in this year of grace, 1967, what odds would our individual lay on his chances or those of his descendants for a future of equal safety and equal liberty here at home or anywhere in the world? If his bet is not to be a blind bet, he will need to learn the nature and strength of what he is betting against, the new potentials of Western man's new creations, his new images, new tools, new things, new weapons, and the new ways of man with man that they elicit. Confronting them, he must needs learn to think anew and to act anew, if he is to live on as a free man in a free society. And he must always have in mind that learning is like breathing or eating: no one else can do it for him; he must needs do it for himself.

I conceive that it is the function of adult education, as the new imperative of our times, to facilitate the adult's learning to do this.

But how, I am unable to say. I do not believe that treatises or laboratory experiments on adult education can tell us. I do know that every so often it gets done, with the methods of trial and error, under the hazards of the classroom. But I have not yet come upon enough reliable evidence for a general rule regarding who or what, in a classroom, will free a learner's spirit and set it on the pursuit of knowledge which is liberation for itself not only. Perhaps there is a hint in the oracle of a nun's reply to a belligerent white heckler who called out at a moment of rest during that long Freedom March of authentic Americans down the hot, dustchoked Alabama road. "What are you trying to do to the white race?" he shouted. "Educate it" was her clear, unhurried reply, "educate it."

THE CONTINUING TASK

James B. Whipple

I

The three provocative papers presented here, taken individually and together, give us much to think about and have many implications for purposeful higher continuing education in this "brave new world." We have already begun to explore these implications, but I am confident that our explorations were only a beginning—that the seeds planted here will continue to grow.

Mr. Houle has referred to this occasion as a birthday party (albeit a mixed-up one as he himself has pointed out). Thus it seems appropriate to hear from the birthday boy—to give the adolescent his chance to tell his parents (AUEC)[1] and his godparents (NUEA)[2] what he thinks. This is my task.

It is fascinating to observe how psychological concepts to explain individual behavior apply to organizations. I will not elaborate on Mr. Houle's analogy but merely agree that Gesell hits the nail on the head—this is a difficult age for CSLEA. However, let me add (and I'm sure Mr. Houle would agree) that there is a point where the analogy breaks down. Members of the staff are adults. Furthermore, both as individuals and as an organization we have responsibilities which are part of maturity—in our case, to serve the field of higher adult education.

I am sure there are times when it appears as if the Center and university adult educators were working at cross purposes—when the Center seems to ignore the practical demands of the field and when adult educators appear to be unwilling to experiment with the Center's ideas. This tension is neither unnatural nor undesirable. At the recent Syracuse seminar on Political Backgrounds for Adult Education, Stephen K.

---

[1] Association of University Evening Colleges.

[2] National University Extension Association.

Bailey commented about a similar tension between himself as dean of the Maxwell School and his faculty. Although the tension between the dean and his faculty was sometimes frustrating, sometimes acute, Bailey argued it was also constructive; if it did not exist he would be worried and would try to create it. Although the circumstances are quite different, I believe that this kind of tension must exist between the Center and the field as we move toward common goals from different points of view. I believe you need us to help develop more effective higher liberal education for adults. I know we need you, because we cannot function except within the context of the university divisions operating adult education programs. Therefore it seemed important to share with you the Center's perspective on its task in 1967.

The Center's task may be stated quite simply. Although the details of the situation have changed considerably for all of us, I believe the Center must set its sights on one continuing task: to help higher education strengthen and develop liberal education for adults.

II

In 1953, John B. Schwertman put his finger on a key problem faced by the Center. In a report to the Fund for Adult Education on "The University Evening College and Adult Education," Schwertman described evening colleges as "pragmatic" and "utilitarian," and summarized adult education as a growing movement which was not anti-liberal but was largely non-liberal in nature.[3]

In the original plans for the Center, there was a note of optimism regarding the readiness of evening colleges for liberal education for adults—some programs and some help on promotion were all it would take. Actually Schwertman's analysis was a recognition that the situation was more complicated. Of course there were many problems, but the obvious one he singled out for CSLEA was liberal education. In this connection he suggested that university adult education was non-liberal because it was forced to deal with an anti-liberal society. In 1953, we more or less accepted the Schwertman position at face value. We assumed that we were forced to be non-liberal. It was a fact of life which meant that we could only hope to be able to sneak in a little liberal education here and there, or provide programs for the deviants who were not *anti-liberal*. Today I think we have moved to an open recognition that the *anti-liberal* spirit does not force us to take any such position. We have chosen to follow a middle ground as the path of least resistance and a route to survival. But certainly for the Center, survival is an empty thing unless it makes the advance of liberal education in an *anti-liberal* society its continuing task.

---

[3] The words—liberal, non-liberal, and anti-liberal—are used here and throughout this paper in an intellectual context and carry no political implication.

Before I go any further let me point out that *to cry havoc* is one of the easy and popular sports of our times. Actually, the *anti-liberal* spirit has been a dominant theme throughout American history. This is what bothered Emerson over one hundred years ago when he wrote: "Things are in the saddle and ride men."[4] Thirty years earlier a popular and perceptive foreign visitor had been saying the same thing. Alexis de Tocqueville emphasized our taste for physical well-being: "To satisfy the least wants of the body and the littlest conveniences of life is uttermost in every mind."[5] He saw Americans as men of action who were more addicted to practical than theoretical science. They "not only seldom indulge in meditation, but they naturally entertain less esteem for it."[6]

Today we have our own version of *anti-liberalism*, but I think we can say we have it in a more acute form. Today, liberal education has been placed on a pedestal, alongside motherhood and God. In this vein there are the high-sounding phrases such as the statement from the report on *Goals for Americans* referred to by Mr. Kallen: if we are to survive we must produce "certain specially needed kinds of educated talent." But, the statement continues, these educational tasks "can not and should not crowd out the basic goals of our educational system; to foster educational fulfilment and to nurture the free, rational and responsible men and women without whom our kind of society cannot endure."

Having pledged allegiance to the appropriate idols, it is possible for most of us to get on with the job of non-liberal education. As Mr. Kallen has pointed out:

---

[4] Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Ode Inscribed to W. H. Channing," *Poems* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1904), p. 78.

[5] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (New York: Vintage Books, 1945), Vol. II, p. 136.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

> The individual is conceived anew like a thing or tool, to be exchanged for another whenever authority . . . decides to do so. That which must survive and grow is the organization—the bank, the business, the church, the state, any institution, any establishment—over which persons of authority rule. The individual signifies only by his place in the organization's structure. Other things being equal, he is expendable. The management of men is designed to function like the manipulation of things.

Although we are reluctant to think of American society as materialistic or anti-liberal in spirit, and although we can find scattered examples to prove it is not so, I do not believe it is necessary to document the Schwertman notion. However, I would like to suggest one way to characterize the anti-liberal nature of our times. Ours is often described as the Anxious Age. The term was created in 1950 by W. H. Auden in a poem called, "The Age of Anxiety." The poem is set in time of war. "Necessity is associated with horror and freedom with boredom."[7] Auden makes it clear that the anxiety is deeper than the war. His characters are lonely, feel valueless as persons, cannot love or be loved. Of course there are many other ways to characterize our time; it has been called the cybernetic age, the age of automation, the electronic age, but the emphasis here is on what is happening to the material structure of the world. I prefer the anxious age because the term concerns what happens to people, and thus it is more relevant to liberal education.

It goes without saying that anxiety can be a good thing. The response to normal anxiety is creativity. This is the kind of response we can expect from the anxiety implicit in the tension between the Center and the field. But anxiety can become destructive when we are unable to deal with the anxiety-producing situation. Then we become immobilized or irrational. Rollo May calls this neurotic anxiety and Jules Henry, a great fear or obsession. The "anxiety reducing measures," he writes in Culture Against Man,

> transgress the bounds of reality; fly in the face of facts; have widely ramifying, unanticipated consequences, and most important are self-destructive in the long run. A person with an obsession takes steps that give immediate relief from his anxiety, seizing upon what seems at the moment the element that immediately threatens his survival, only to discover later that he has chosen wrongly.[8]

---

[7] W. H. Auden, The Age of Anxiety (New York, 1947), p. 3.

[8] Jules Henry, Culture Against Man (New York: Random House, 1963), p. 121.

Examples of the anxieties of our times are countless. In his paper, Mr. Blackwell discussed one when he talked of the new way of urban life which he summarized as "faster, more dynamic, less isolated, more creative, more innovative, more superficial, more anonymous, more transient, and characterized by higher mobility . . . than was the former rural society." The characteristics are not only different, they are complicated and contradictory; this helps make the urban way of life one of our anxieties. I will mention only two other examples of our anxieties.

One great anxiety is rooted in our economic institutions which emphasize destructive competition and value a material standard of living above all else in life. Once again we find that sharp-eyed observer, De Tocqueville, admiring the creative, adventuresome American spirit and at the same time alarmed by our materialism. What he saw in the first part of the nineteenth century is even more frighteningly true today.

> A native of the United States clings to the world's goods as if he were certain never to die; and he is so hasty at grasping at all within his reach, that one would suppose he was constantly afraid of not living long enough to enjoy them. He clutches everything, he holds nothing fast, but soon loosens his grip to pursue fresh gratifications.[9]

It seems almost unbelievable that a century-old commentary could have such a contemporary ring. Yet today we find our materialistic, technological drives threatening to engulf us as human beings.

I am not concerned here with capitalism or with the so-called threat of automation. I am concerned with our pecuniary philosophy which drives us blindly into getting bigger, into consuming more products in order to nourish a technology which operates on the basis of what the president of General Motors in 1956 enthusiastically described as the "dynamics of obsolescence."

The philosophical system supporting our pecuniary culture is advertising, which brazenly uses pseudo-truth, women, and most of their anatomy to urge us to greater and greater consumption of products in order to make obsolescence dynamic. The advertising industry cannot claim the credit nor receive the blame for this state of affairs, for it is merely the philosopher of our materialistic way of life—for our depersonalization, or what Martin Buber calls the "thingification" resulting from the dominance of the I-It relationship. Nowhere is there a more profound reflection of this depersonalization than in advertising where the human mind is alluded to as the "brain-box," and where we tolerate an image of women as nervous, feeble-minded, vapidly whimsical sex machines.

---

[9] De Tocqueville, op. cit., p. 144.

All of us enjoy material goods, and very properly so; but the price we are paying is high—perhaps higher than we suspect. Over the generations the collective self of the American people has been educated to put a high living standard in place of self-realization. It is indeed enough to make us anxious.

The other great reflection of the anxiety of our age is our great fear, Soviet Russia—or, perhaps increasingly, Communist China. Since the end of World War II, Russia (in Jules Henry's words) has been a "nightmare calling our very survival in question and depriving a proud people of its power to think."[10] Our anxiety pushes individuals, who act intelligently and liberally on every other score, into acting irrationally and illiberally. Examples of our irrationality are countless. To name only four, there have been the futile trade restrictions on Russia and other Communist countries in the face of evidence that they do no good; the refusal to recognize China or Cuba; outer space competition; the war in Vietnam. Perhaps the most tragic aspect of the "nightmare," however, is the fact that it has inspired in us a disregard for people at home as well as abroad that is almost beyond comprehension.

One thing that both anxieties have in common is a tendency to deprive us of our humanity. A person becomes an anti-liberal thing in danger of losing his identity, his self—and in most cases seeing no way out.

Whether you wish to accept my characterization of our anti-liberal society or another is not important. I think we will all agree that the maintenance of our humanity in an anxious world is an increasingly acute problem and a major responsibility for higher education. It cries out for liberal education. In this connection I see the Center's task to assist universities in the development of a more effective and more liberal response.

III

Here I shall not try to answer the question: How can liberal education serve this purpose? But I would like to make six observations.

---

[10] Henry, op. cit., p. 123

First, generally speaking, I agree with Mr. Kallen that liberal education is not a course or a series of courses. As he put it:

> If, as I am convinced, the knowledge and skills of the working day can nourish and enlarge our freedoms no less than the arts and letters and games of the leisured night, vocational education can be rendered as liberating as liberal education is held to be, and liberal education can be shown to be as illiberal as vocational education is held to be. How either works out follows from how the learner informs himself, how the information functions in the reformation of his vision and ways.

At the Center we sometimes talk of liberal education as a process—to liberate or free a man from the variety of social or personal problems that in one way or another enslave or hamper us all.

Second, I believe we can still learn a great deal from our vocationally oriented colleagues who make continuing vocational education meaningful by placing it in the context of the work situation. Conventional liberal arts curricula may provide a good foundation for growth, but continuing liberal education must be related to specific life situations—at work, in the execution of social responsibilities and other leisure time preoccupations, or in the context of our anxieties.

Third, this kind of continuing liberal education calls for great variety and flexibility, and by and large defies curricular standardization. It does not mean that all education must be with Mark Hopkins and the log, but more often than not the starting point must be the individual, and it will require tutorials or other systems of independent study. One such system, as Mr. Houle mentioned, was proposed by McGeorge Bundy several years ago. He suggests that the "old professors and young students" must expect to see hours or days or weeks at a time of independent study [on their campuses] by highly civilized men. In another direction, at Boston University Malcolm Knowles expects the individual graduate student to take responsibility for his own education: to set goals, decide on appropriate resources, and evaluate the results. Of course there will be many areas where common backgrounds and common interests will permit group education, but even here the prerequisite will be the life situation rather than last year's course in literature or sociology. Mr. Houle and his graduate students at the University of Chicago have done considerable research on the characteristics of continuing learners and the situations which motivate their continuing study.

Fourth, liberal education cannot be compartmentalized. It is not a pill that one takes before, after, or in between other educational fare. It must be developed as an integral part of the individual's total continuing education.

Fifth, we must not ignore or reject the classical purposes of a liberal education which go back at least to the Greeks. Certainly a major escape from our anxieties is self-deception, and a major pitfall of independent study can be self-deception. Liberal education continues to be a major way to achieve the Socratic precept: Know thyself.

My final observation relates to the liberal education component in professional education for university adult educators. I include it here particularly because this is a leadership conference. I will be brief, in part because we have come full circle. Mr. Houle has already made the case for professional growth in his keynote address, arguing that we must continue to move from craft toward profession.

Like Mr. Houle, I do not want to engage in the tedious debate over the definition of a profession. But I would like to suggest that a useful way to look at a profession was developed by Abraham Flexner many years ago. According to Flexner, three important characteristics of a profession are that it is intellectual, it is scholarly, and it is practical. By and large, we have little difficulty with the practical. If that is all we are, then I think we are a craft—and fifteen years ago I believe that is what we tended to be.

What does it mean to be intellectual and scholarly in our profession? I think it means to study and reflect as deeply as possible about the situation in which we must practice, about the people whom we must educate, and about the processes and substance of education for adults.

During the past fifteen years there has been impressive growth in both the quality and quantity of professional adult education. In addition to the growth and innovation in study for advanced degrees, there have been new directions such as the residential workshops at the University of Chicago and Michigan State or the Syracuse seminars on Backgrounds of Adult Education.

The Center does not presume to serve as a professional school. We see our task to maintain, or more often to introduce, a liberal component into continuing professional education. Generally speaking this liberal element must be concerned with context or perspective, and perhaps it should be called relational education in the sense that it must help the individual see his profession in relation to himself, his educational institution, and his society.

IV

One final aspect of our continuing task is relevance. Relevance means a rising up, a distillation of the important out of the urgent and the expedient. There is much to be done and all of us are often tempted to start with the expedient and rationalize that it is relevant. In this way we may do many good things, but the danger is that they distract us from the important and perhaps lull us into a false sense of complacency—in the Center's case if we are busy, and in yours if you get students. The task must be relevant.

In our fifteen-year report, published in the most recent issue of the newsletter, we talk about enduring concerns. In addition to liberal education they are: teaching and learning; a proper place for adult education within the total university; the structure and organization of adult education; relation of university adult education to the total field; and communication.

Our concerns are those aspects of higher adult education in which we have an interest and a care. They are your concerns, as we will continue to work with the field when and where we can. Actually, all our concerns have some relationship to liberal education for adults, but we must always be careful not to deceive ourselves by starting with the expedient and rationalizing that it is relevant.

A task is something that is imposed by necessity, and our relevant task must be to assist higher education in maintaining and developing liberal education for adults. I suspect this will always be someone's continuing task. Just as our political freedom can never be taken for granted, so we must be alert that man has both the inclination and ability to be free in mind and spirit.

Each one of us must decide for himself and for his organization what the relevant or important tasks may be—and of course in your case there may be several. For CSLEA I am proposing a joint task—for we cannot work alone: that the Center and higher adult educators continue to work together to maintain and develop higher liberal adult education in an anxious and anti-liberal world.